

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN.  
VISWA BHARATI  
LIBRARY

273.294

B56





JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION  
TO JESUS



( THE  
APOCALYPSE OF JESUS

*Being a Step in the Search for the  
Historical Christ*

BY

F. W. WORSLEY, M.A., B.D., DURHAM

University College, Durham, and  
Clare College, Cambridge

*Author of "The Fourth Gospel and the  
Synoptists," "The Gospel of the Catholic  
Church"*

DEMY 8VO., 7/6 NETT

LONDON: J. & R. BENNETT, LIMITED

# JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION TO JESUS

*With Some Account of His Following*

BY

ALBAN BLAKISTON, M.A.

LONDON

J. & J. BENNETT LTD.

(THE CENTURY PRESS)

8, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN

*First Published in 1912*

---

WESSEX PRESS LTD., PORTSMOUTH

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	7
I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	9
II THE BAPTISM OF JESUS . . . . .	11
III THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF JOHN'S BAPTISING . . . . .	15
IV JOHN'S RELIGIOUS GENIUS . . . . .	32
V JOHN AND THE ELIJAH . . . . .	40
VI THE DEATH OF JOHN . . . . .	69
VII THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE BAPTISM . . . . .	86
VIII THE EVIDENCE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL . . . . .	93
IX JOHN AND THE BAPTISTS IN THE ACTS . . . . .	116
X THE GROWTH OF THE BAPTIST SECT . . . . .	135
XI THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND . . . . .	156
XII THE LIFE OF JOHN BAPTIST . . . . .	184
NOTES . . . . .	199
INDEX . . . . .	255



## PREFACE

THE question which this volume attempts, most inadequately, to answer, is "What was John Baptist's place in history?" It is suggested that the Prophet's work was spread over a longer period of time, his mission was more independent in character, and his influence upon his own, and upon successive, generations more far-reaching than has yet been allowed for by students of Christian origins. The documentary evidence is, at the present, too incomplete to permit of anything like a demonstrative proof of these propositions; but a critical treatment of our New Testament sources appears to suggest conclusions which are probable in themselves, and which receive some support from extraneous testimony. At the same time the very existence of a Baptist sect, in conflict with the Christian Church upon the most vital and fundamental point in her teaching, provides sufficient ground for the evangelical tendency to obscure John's actual importance to the religious movements of his day, and to magnify what was an episode only, albeit the determining episode, in his

career, into its consciously dominating factor. The attempt to get behind our authorities, and to write a biography of the subject of our investigations, reveals many *lacunae* which can only be conjecturally filled in. The reconstruction of motives actuating historical characters, and of the inner relations of events, is frequently the work of the historical imagination; and its efforts must stand or fall by their inherent probability.

A. B.

# JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION TO JESUS

## I

### INTRODUCTION

THE purpose of this essay is to discover what there is of individuality about the person of the Baptist; to rescue him from the position of entire subordination to Jesus, to which our New Testament authorities relegate him; and to appraise the historical character of the relation which subsisted between himself and Jesus, so far as it may be possible to isolate this from the theological judgment of the early Christian writers. We shall base our investigations, first and foremost, upon a close study of the relevant Scriptural evidence; but we shall also have occasion to survey, in particular, the religious field of the historical background; in order that we may endow the figure of the Baptist with some distinctness, and sharpness of outline, in relation to it. It may suffice to say, in advance, that the attempt to be made is not free of very grave perplexities; and that the suggested solutions of



many of the problems to be faced are in the highest degree tentative.

It will be convenient, for the purposes of investigation, to take one central incident, from which we may work both backwards and forwards. And that which immediately suggests itself is, of course, the one recorded meeting of John Baptist with Jesus, the incident of the Baptism.

## II

### THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

(Mk. i. 9-11; Mt. iii. 13-17; Lk. iii. 21, 22.)

1. The narrative of the Baptism of Jesus at the hands of John forms part of the common synoptic tradition.<sup>1</sup> Jesus, we are told, came from Nazareth of Galilee, where He had spent His childhood and early manhood in strict seclusion, and was baptised by John in the river Jordan.<sup>2</sup> According to Matthew, the baptismal rite was the purpose of His journey south; and it is interesting to notice, thus early in His public career, the purposive character of His actions.<sup>3</sup> We have no reason to suppose that John

<sup>1</sup> Streeter finds that the account of the Baptism appeared independently in Mk. and Q; and that, while Mt. has conflated Q and Mk., Lk. produces Q alone, with slight editorial additions. Allen, on the other hand, is unable to assign the Baptism to the Q which he reconstructs (viz., a "Book of the Sayings and Discourses of Jesus"); and suggests another, unspecified, source for it. cf. *"Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem,"* pp. 187, 274.

<sup>2</sup> See appended note

<sup>3</sup> See appended note

departed from what appears to have been the usual custom in baptising amongst the Jews; with whom the ceremony involved total immersion. And, indeed, we have some evidence in the text that this was the custom to which Jesus submitted.<sup>4</sup> Two miraculous events are reported to have occurred in connection with the Baptism; the descent of the Spirit in the form of a Dove,<sup>5</sup> and an audible Voice from Heaven. In connection with an event so well attested as the Baptism, it would be idle to deny some manifestation of spiritual forces, such as would account for the importance it assumed in the lives of both Jesus and the Baptist. But when we come to analyse the objective presentation given to that manifestation in the traditional account, it is legitimate to point to various sources which may have had their influence. Thus, with regard to the descent of the Spirit, we may remark that the personification of God's Spirit was already achieved in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical books, just as it is frequently found in later Rabbinical writings;<sup>6</sup> while the figure of the Dove may easily have been suggested by the "brooding" of God's Spirit at Creation.<sup>7</sup> But we

<sup>4</sup> See appended note

<sup>5</sup> Lk. adds to the general account, first that the Baptism was private; and next that the descent of the Spirit was the accompaniment of, or the answer to, the prayer in which He engaged after being baptised. This is editorial matter derived from sources at present unknown to us.

<sup>6</sup> See appended note

<sup>7</sup> See appended note

have also to notice a growing tendency to materialize the vision; for while in Mark we read that Jesus "saw the heavens rent, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon Him," in Matthew we have "like a dove," and in Luke it becomes "in bodily form as a dove."<sup>8</sup> Then, with regard to the Heavenly Voice, we seem to have a reminiscence of the *Bath Qol* of Rabbinical literature, a sort of Oracle of the Spirit, of which there are several other instances in the New Testament.<sup>9</sup> The words uttered are, in the main, identical with those of the Voice at the Transfiguration.<sup>10</sup>

2. To this account of the Baptism, a tradition, embedded in Matthew's special source, contributes John's reluctance to perform the function of his office in Jesus' case, together with Jesus' argument that "thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." It will be necessary to discuss the meaning of these words at a later stage. But here we may notice that the incident undoubtedly suggests, whether from design or not it is not easy to say, a previous acquaintance, and even intimacy, between John

<sup>8</sup> Mk. has it that the Spirit descended "into Him," which is on a par with the vivid realism of the ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος; and this Mt. softens to "descending . . . and coming upon him." It is possible that, in view of the account of the Virgin birth by the operation of the Spirit which he has inserted, Mt. is anxious to suggest that this is a gift of the Spirit for a particular purpose, and not the first immanent presence.

<sup>9</sup> See appended note

<sup>10</sup> See appended note

and Jesus. Perhaps, in the wide series of slightly different varieties which the oral tradition must have assumed, this may represent a sort of connecting link between the Lukan childhood narrative, which brings the two together in their infancy, and the Johannine record, according to which John was possessed of a very adequate conception of Jesus' Person and Mission. In other words, it is possible that we have here a tradition of an intercourse before the commencement of the ministry of either; a modified form of the Lukan, and an undeveloped form of the Johannine, position. But, if that is so, we must admit the disparity between this and the main body of tradition, in both the synoptists and the 4th Gospel, which appears to disallow any such previous acquaintance.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> In Jn. i. 31, 33, we have the emphatic "I knew him not;" not to be explained away, as Westcott, "*John*," by "I knew him not as Messiah." In the Synoptic account we are given to understand that Jesus sought out John, for the purpose of being baptised by him, but we have no hint of any mutual recognition. And even the early chapters of Lk. do not venture to suggest any intercourse between the two in childhood or early manhood.

### III

#### THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF JOHN'S BAPTISING.

(Mk. i. 2-4, 7, 8; Mt. iii. 1-3, 5-12;  
Lk. iii. 2<sup>b</sup>-9, 15-18.)

I. But we must examine, with some care, the accounts which are given us of the nature and purpose of John's baptising, in order that we may see how that purpose was satisfied in the case of Jesus. Mark's introduction of the figure of the Baptist is singularly abrupt; but at the same time we derive from it a very clear idea of the nature of John's mission. "John appeared in the desert," we read; "he who baptised, and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins."<sup>12</sup> In the first place, we may possibly infer that John himself claimed the title of *Vox clamantis*, in preference to any with a more definite signification.<sup>13</sup> Then we must notice the wide popularity of the preacher, due as much, perhaps, to the feeling that in him prophecy was again revived, as to his personal character and

<sup>12</sup> See appended note

<sup>13</sup> See appended note

teaching.<sup>14</sup> Of those who went to hear John, we gather that large numbers were affected by his exhortations and instructions, and proceeded to receive baptism at his hands, after they had made confession of their sins.<sup>15</sup> We shall have occasion later on to discuss the various elements of John's preaching, and to judge how far these elements are characteristic of different periods in his ministry. It is enough to notice here that his preaching of baptism is brought into connection with the proclamation of the advent of One mightier than he; more especially because John is made, in this connection, to contrast their respective functions in relation to the rite of baptism: "I baptised you with water," he says; "but he shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost"<sup>16</sup>; but also because the Baptist is made to confess himself the slave, the mere sandal-bearer, of his greater Successor. The main points in the foregoing narrative may be summarised as follows. On the one hand, John's baptism required, as its sole condition, repentance; and that repentance

<sup>14</sup> The cherished hope of the reappearance of the prophetic spirit may be seen in 1 Macc. iv. 46; xiv. 41; which is reflected in Mt. xi. 9; xvii. 10.

<sup>15</sup> See appended note

<sup>16</sup> The Messiah was to be endowed with the Holy Spirit, in order that He might impart Him. cf. Is. xi. 2. "*Ezech*" xlix. 3—a passage based on Isaiah lxii. 2—"the Lord of Spirits seated Him on the throne of His glory, and the Spirit of Righteousness was poured out upon Him." "*Psalms of Solomon*" xvii. 42: "Ὅτι ὁ θεὸς κατηργάσατο αὐτὸν δυνατόν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ."

was to be assured by the confession of sins. But while the repentance, as witnessed in the rite of baptism, bore promise of some future remission of sins, the baptism itself did not convey forgiveness. On the other hand, the Coming One, whose advent John announced, would also baptise; but His baptism would contain precisely what John's lacked. John's was "with water" only; that is, it was a seal<sup>17</sup> of repentance; it began and ended with the disposition of the person baptised. The Other's was "with the Holy Ghost"; that is, it imparted a grace, or a Presence, which would, presumably, secure the remission of sins to which the repentance looked forward.

2. Before passing on to consider the fragmentary reports of the Baptist's sermons, we may glance at two details which have their own importance. The first of these is the rather dubious phrase which occurs in Matthew only, "Repent ye: for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." It is probable that the second half of this sentence is editorial,<sup>18</sup> and that it has been assimilated from the preaching of Jesus; and this, for the following reasons. The prophecy of Malachi,<sup>19</sup> which the Evangelists, if not John, regarded as being fulfilled in the Baptist's person, makes the appearance of Elijah immediately precede, not the approach of the Kingdom, but the Day of the Lord; and the two are distinct

<sup>17</sup> See appended note

<sup>18</sup> See appended note

<sup>19</sup> Mal. iv. 5.



conceptions, though they are variously woven together in the Apocalyptic books.<sup>20</sup> The Day of the Lord sometimes was held to imply the manifestation of Messiah; and it is probable that John, in the latter part of his ministry, thought of a Messiah coming to judgment. But it is a singular fact that, in the Pseudepigraphical literature, the Messiah and the Kingdom are seldom viewed in conjunction; as the one is emphasised, the other tends to disappear.<sup>21</sup> Now, while John distinctly proclaims the Messiah, nowhere else than here does he appear to be concerned with the Kingdom. We may therefore say that repentance, with a view to the reception of the Messianic Baptism, is almost the sole factor of John's preaching.

The second detail is a short passage which we may regard as possessing peculiar significance. "The word of God," it runs, "came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness." This is entirely in the manner of the Old Testament prophets; and, indeed, most nearly resembles the call of Amos.<sup>22</sup> There is, further, a double suggestion in the words. On the one hand, that John continues, or revives, the line of prophets of Israel's pristine glory; that is to say, his teaching harks back to the old models and the old ideas, and is not informed by the Scribal or Apocalyptic ideals

<sup>20</sup> See appended note

<sup>21</sup> Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.* p. 223.

<sup>22</sup> Am. vii. 14, 15.

current in the Judaism of his own day.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, that his teaching, as was that of the Old Testament prophets, is independent, derived immediately from God and not learnt in the schools, and coloured by the qualities of his own personality. It is on these lines that we must expect to find an interpretation of the Baptist's mission; remembering both his special affinity to the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament, and his own measure of independence and originality.

Matthew and Luke add to this general account certain particulars about the preaching of the Baptist, or fragmentary utterances of his that clung to the memories of his audience, which give us succinctly all the points to which we have already adverted.<sup>24</sup> The wrath to come is proclaimed in connection with the advent of the Messiah; repentance is preached as the means by which escape may be had from the incidence of that wrath; and it is preached, moreover, in connection with an exhortation to baptism, which is the seal of its reality; and this reality, or sincerity, is to be gauged by corres-

<sup>23</sup> We shall, at a later stage, enquire to what extent John was allied to any of the existing religious sects; but here we may notice that Mt. (iii. 7) makes both Pharisees and Sadducees responsive to his exhortations. We may take it that the prophetic spirit was attractive to both, while their legalistic formalism was entirely abhorrent to John.

<sup>24</sup> See appended note

ponding works, for the "generation of vipers"<sup>25</sup> must slough their skins and "produce worthy fruits of repentance"; the Day of the Messiah is very near, judgment is already pending, delay would be fatal, for "even now the axe is laid unto the root of the trees"; and, last, it is the offspring of Abraham which is specially to be singled out for punishment and purification.<sup>26</sup> Luke adds to this account of the Baptist's preaching certain counsels given to three separate classes of men, in respect of the worthy fruits of repentance; and these are a valuable commentary upon the practical effectiveness of his work. But we may postpone our consideration of them, until we come to consider the social conditions of the times in which he lived.<sup>27</sup>

4. In an attempt to form an estimate of the position which John's baptising held in relation to his ministry of preaching, it is of importance

<sup>25</sup> Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, the subtle and insincere. cf. Ovid, "*Metamor.*" iii. 531; the "Anguigenæ" were the Thebans who sprang from the dragon's teeth.

<sup>26</sup> See appended note

<sup>27</sup> Lk. iii. 15 is naturally to be connected with Jn. i. 24. The source of both is probably the same, and is obscure; but the tradition belongs to a later date, and is here an editorial interpolation. The theory of John's Messiahship is found full-blown in the so-called "*Zadokite Manifesto*," which we shall be obliged to consider at a later stage. In this passage, it is the rumour that he is the Messiah which leads John first to preach the Messiah's advent in connection with the Day of the Lord. It is characteristic of Lk. to find an historical context for his incidents. cf. vi. 12; xi. 1; x. 1; xiii. 31-33; xvi. 14.

that we should realise that the rite was not an isolated phenomenon, cropping up without historical antecedents and associations, and due solely to the genius of the man himself.<sup>28</sup> We know that the Essenes had a baptism of initiation; and we know, too, that baptism was one of the three rites, enjoined by the religious leaders of the Jews, for the reception of proselytes into the full communion of their Church. It will not be necessary for us to enquire into the nature of the former of these; for the theory that the Baptist had any sort of connection with Essenism has no serious adherents at the present day. But a distinct relation may be established between the baptism of John and that of the Rabbis; and the parallel is instructive for our purpose.<sup>29</sup> In the Old Testament ritual ablutions were undoubtedly, in many cases, regarded as being quasi-sacramental; that is, in the view of the recipients, they actually removed not alone ritual disabilities, but even moral offences; in other words, they imparted a species of what we should call "grace."<sup>30</sup> But later Judaism appears to have entirely discarded this conception; owing, pro-

<sup>28</sup> See appended note

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.* pp. 281-290.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Lev. xv. 13, where the washing effects a reconciliation between God and the man, who was a sinner by token of his issue. Num. viii. 7, 8, where the washing of the Levites is connected with a sin-offering. Lev. xiv. 1-32, the case of the leper (cp. Jn. ix. 2). Deut. xix. 10-14, sanctifying by washing. And see the poetical expressions in Deut. xxi. 6-9; Ps. xxvi. 6.

bably, to its keen desire to dissociate itself from the very crude sacramental ideas prevalent amongst the adjacent heathen peoples, which had always proved a snare to corrupt its own loftier views. Just as circumcision was nothing more than a badge, so baptism was only a pledge; its value was merely that of an official contract.

5. Now John's baptism was very similar to this, in its negative aspect. It possessed, indeed, features which were quite its own, and which made of it a novel experiment. It differed widely from the Rabbinical baptism in its degree of subjectivity; and, principally, in that its stress lay upon the ethical demands of a moral righteousness, while that of the other emphasised the ritual requirements of a legal righteousness. John's baptism, too, was imparted to all who cared to claim it, by the fulfilling of the one condition of repentance. Moreover, in the first instance at least,<sup>31</sup> it bound its recipients to no sort of discipleship, and it initiated them into no religious community narrower than the great multitude who would be elected to stand before the Messiah at His appearing. But it stayed there; it went no further in the direction of positive spiritual realities than the proselyte baptism. The Baptist's

<sup>31</sup> At a later stage, as we shall see, John did found his school of disciples. But in these early days he had formed no idea of a community or church other than that of the Jewish people, which was, of course, the limit to his horizon.

rite, in fact, symbolised a change of heart and life, which was being wrought, not by any mysterious power thereby imparted, but solely by an act of will on the part of the recipient. The symbol was also a pledge of the reality of this process. The repentance John preached was strictly moral; the rite of water was a seal of its utter sincerity; and that was all.

6. The baptism of John, being of this character, is necessarily sharply differentiated from the baptism of the Messiah, with which John contrasts it. The Messianic baptism is not, technically, "with water"; though indeed water is retained as its outward expression and means of conveyance; it is, rather, "with the Holy Ghost and fire."<sup>32</sup> Such a baptism is concerned, not so much with repentance, as with forgiveness. Repentance may indeed be a necessary preliminary, but it is not of the essence of the baptism.<sup>33</sup> Just as repentance must precede forgiveness, so John's baptism had in it a promise, a hope; it looked forward to that which it could not impart. The Messiah's baptism, on the other hand, gives the grace which John's is content implicitly to demand. Thus the baptism of Jesus stands alone, as being strictly sacramental.

7. Here, then, we reach the question propounded some little way back; "How did Jesus fulfil the conditions of John's baptism, and what value attached to that baptism for Him?" In

<sup>32</sup> See appended note

<sup>33</sup> See appended note

attempting to answer that question, we are somewhat transgressing the boundaries of historical exegesis, and wandering into the region of theological speculation or hypothetical conjecture. But it does seem that the Baptism of Jesus at the hands of John just illustrates the difference that has been indicated between the rites of both. The actual rite was, in this case as in others, a symbol, and nothing more. What was more, on this occasion, was quite independent of John and his baptism. The baptism itself was a symbol, a pledge; not indeed of repentance; since Jesus had nothing whereof to repent<sup>34</sup>; but of utter sincerity, and of the intense fervour of a will absolutely attuned to that of the Father. "Thou art my Son, the Beloved; in thee I am well pleased," runs the Voice from Heaven. 'As Man, Jesus approaches God in human wise. His sincere devotion to the Father's will demands a gift of power proportionate to the offering made; and as the baptism is the inauguration of His ministry, the gift required will be related to the approaching work, and will be the secret of His own power.<sup>35</sup> This gift comes to Him, not in

<sup>34</sup> The sinlessness of Jesus, in connection with His baptism, is brought out in a passage from the "*Gospel according to the Hebrews*," quoted by Jerome, "*Contra Pelag.*" iii. 2. "Ecce mater domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: 'Joannes baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus et baptizemur ab eo.' Dixit autem eis 'Quid peccavi ut yadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est'."

<sup>35</sup> The power by which he "went about doing good" (Ac. x. 38) and attending always to the Father's Will. cf. Lk. xxii. 42; Jn. iv. 34; v. 30; vi. 38-40.

the baptism, nor through the Baptist; indeed John is fully aware that he in no way mediates the gift; but directly from God, in the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Him.<sup>36</sup> And, just as the baptism was, in His case, a symbol, not of repentance, but of sincerity; so the gift of the Spirit, which was, in the future, to be the distinguishing mark of Jesus' baptism, came not as a washing of regeneration, a signal act of forgiveness, since in Him there was naught to forgive; but as an endowment of that fulness of spiritual life, to which, each in his own measure, but none as completely as Jesus, forgiveness introduces all men.<sup>37</sup> This account gives us at least a tentative explanation of Jesus' words at the baptismal scene, together with their immediate context, as chronicled by Matthew; "Suffer it now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."<sup>38</sup> The steps to the fulfilment of righteousness for men are these; repentance and sincerity of will, witnessed by the act of confession, and confirmed by the symbol of baptism; and then, through

<sup>36</sup> The descent of the Spirit takes place after the baptismal immersion (Mk.), when He has left the water (Mt.), while He is subsequently praying (Lk.). And John witnessed the descent as an unprecedented occurrence (Jn. i: 32).

<sup>37</sup> For the gift of the Spirit in relation to Jesus' Manhood, and the real growth which that implied, it is sufficient here to refer to Gore, "*The Incarnation*," Lect. vi.; Gore, "*Dissertations*," No. 2; Sanday, "*Christologies*," lectures vi., vii.

<sup>38</sup> See appended note



that same symbol of baptism, forgiveness, which is imparted and completed by the indwelling of the Spirit. In the case of Jesus, owing to the fact that there was no sin found in Him, two of these steps were omitted; repentance, that is to say, and forgiveness.<sup>39</sup> But He fulfilled all righteousness, first by His own utter obedience to the Father's Will, and then by the reception of the indwelling Spirit, which signalled His Father's pleasure in Him. The plural, "us," may be explained as follows. The righteousness of Jesus was not of a personal; so much as of a world-wide importance; for, in the Divine scheme of human redemption, His righteousness was to be of saving value to all who, being themselves sinners, should make any claim upon it. But, if the baptism of Jesus was a necessary and prominent feature in the earthly ministry, then the Baptist must be regarded as having his own subordinate place in the drama of human salvation. For this reason, Jesus is content to associate him with Himself as a fellow-worker. It is impossible that John should have at all adequately grasped Jesus' meaning; but he would have understood this much, in all probability—that Jesus was a Teacher of a Righteousness superior to his own, and that this new Righteousness was bound up with a gift of the

<sup>39</sup> It would be quite outside the scope of this essay to discuss whether, in His baptism as in His death, Jesus may be regarded, in a representative sense, as the absolved Penitent.

Spirit; whom Jesus would make men to know.<sup>40</sup> The words which John used in his attempt to hinder Jesus, "I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me?" were used, we must remember, before the descent of the Holy Spirit, and, though they involve a recognition of the fact that Jesus was greater than he, based perhaps upon a sort of spiritual intuition, they could not have implied a knowledge that Jesus would Himself institute a baptism, or that He would impart the Spirit by means of a baptism. It was not until John had witnessed the descent of the Spirit upon Him, that he commenced to preach the baptism of the Spirit which Jesus was to originate.<sup>41</sup>

(Mk. xi. 27-33; Mt. xxi. 23-27; Lk. xx. 1-8.)

8. The question as to John's right to baptise was raised by Jesus Himself, late on in His

<sup>40</sup> • So, in the "*Zadokite Manifesto*," page i. ll. 10, 11: "And he raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness, in order to guide them in the way of His heart." P. ii. ll. 12, 13: "And He made them know His Holy Spirit through His Messiah, and He is true."

<sup>41</sup> • This is, of course, highly conjectural. But we have already seen that the various elements of John's preaching have reached us in a condition of artificial combination; and it certainly appears reasonable to suppose that John's forecast was based on what he had witnessed. And this view receives some support from the arrangement in Jn. i. 26, 27, 32, 33. There the prophecy of the Messiah stands unrelated to the Spiritual baptism; and the knowledge of the Spiritual baptism results from the evidence at Jesus' baptism.

ministry, in an interesting fashion. On a certain occasion, when He was teaching in the temple, the chief priests, scribes and elders (that is, we may take it, the temple custodians and officials, who would have belonged in the main to the Sadducean party), came upon Him, and questioned Him as to the authority for His actions and words, and the source of that authority. Since Jesus was not a scribe, nor a member of any Rabbinical school, the question was, in the circumstances, a natural one, though probably put with hostile intent. It appears from the narrative that the collision was not a chance one, but an arranged meeting; the three orders of the *Synedrium* sending representatives in a deputation, with reference to the cleansing of the temple which had taken place on the previous day. They were to require Jesus to produce His credentials as to His fitness to be a teacher, and to name the Rabbi who had been His master, and who had, as it were, given Him His diploma. Even if Jesus' answer had been satisfactory from their point of view, they might still have called Him to account for His interference with the temple organisation; had not Jesus turned the tables upon them by publicly discrediting their spiritual discernment. He retorted by putting to them a preliminary problem for their solution; "The baptism of John—whence was it? from heaven, or from men?" The question is not unrelated to the demand of the deputation. It might be generally sup-

posed, both from His baptism at John's hands, and from the witness the Baptist bore to Him, that He had received His commission from His predecessor. Whether that verdict were true or not, at least His relation to the Baptist raised the question of the deputation to a higher level, in taking it back one degree. The authority of Jesus' actions depended upon the authority of John's baptism. They must stand or fall together. Now we shall have occasion, at a later stage, to note how powerfully the Baptist had stirred the mind of the populace. Here we gather, that the majority seems to have acquiesced in the belief that he was a prophet, that is that he was independent of human sanctions, and received his commission direct from God. They did not, indeed, connect him with the Elijah; but he was, to them, a revival of the old prophetic school which men deemed to have passed away for ever. The crowd, awaiting the answer of the deputation in the precincts of the temple, was composed of men who espoused this view of John; and undoubtedly an answer unfavourable to the dignity of their hero would have aroused in them a very dangerous humour. Such a verdict, to employ the language of Gamaliel, would in their estimation have amounted to "fighting against God." Therefore it behoved the deputation to be wary and circumspect. If we take it that these representatives from the *Synedrium* were Sadducees; which, in view of the fact that the custody of

the temple was in their hands mainly, and that it was the breach of order in the temple which was the ground of their complaint, is probable; then we may remember that, despite the fact of their holding the higher ranks of the priesthood, the Sadducees were in the main politicians and free-thinkers, who preferred to leave the religious guardianship of the people in the hands of the Pharisees. Though Matthew makes certain Sadducees come to John's baptism, the language the Baptist used to them, their habits of thought, and their intensely aristocratic principles, render it very unlikely that his preaching would have made any impression upon them as a class; and their indifference to his spiritual forcefulness would sufficiently account for the apparent absence of opposition, on their part, to John during his ministry. But, at the present juncture, it would have been ill-advised, and inconvenient, for them to run counter to the prepossessions of the crowd, however much they might in their hearts despise them; nor could they afford, in their position as members of the council, to exhibit any inconsistency in their previous cynical judgment of the Baptist; above all things they must save their face. Therefore it seemed expedient to them to give an evasive answer, trusting that their dialectical impotence would not be too obvious.<sup>42</sup> But we must carefully notice what Jesus' question really

<sup>42</sup> See on the whole passage, Swete, "St. Mark," pp. 246-249. "Oxf. Syn. Studies," p. 401.

amounted to. Was John's baptism from Heaven, that is, from God, dispensed by divine authority and commission; or was it from men, that is, from the authority of Rabbinical precedent, but without any directly divine warrant or sanction? The question does not raise any alternative as to the nature and effects of the baptism; but simply as to the authority which lay behind it. And upon that authority depended the solution of the further problem, as to whether John was indeed a prophet, or not. In other words, Jesus was not asking whether the baptism was a channel of divine grace, on the one hand, or merely a symbol of repentance, on the other; a sacrament, or a Jewish ablution; but whether the baptism was a legitimate institution or a fraud, the baptiser a prophet or a charlatan.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>43</sup> See appended note

## IV

### JOHN'S RELIGIOUS GENIUS

(Mk. ii. 18-22; Mt. ix. 14-17; Lk. v. 33-39.)

1. It is now time to leave the ministration of baptism, and to go forward to consider the contrast in practice and spirit between Himself and John, to which Jesus draws attention in His answer to the question about fasting.<sup>44</sup> As is the custom with certain Jews of our own day, so also in the times of Jesus there were a number of pious persons who adopted a more rigorous standard of life than was actually prescribed by the Law, and who fasted on various occasions

<sup>44</sup> The passage, in each of the three Synoptists, follows upon the feast in Levi's house, and the question, addressed to Jesus by the Pharisees, why He chose to feed with publicans and sinners. In Mt. and Mk., though standing next to each other, they are dissociated in point of time and place; but in Lk. they are linked together in a connected narrative form. Possibly the oral tradition which lies behind Mk. and Q had already grouped the incidents, as being similar in character. Hawkins, in "*Ox. Synoptic Studies*," p. 136, would assign Lk. v. 39 to Q, instead of marking it as editorial.

other than the great national fasts, thinking that by so doing they accumulated for themselves a store of meritorious deeds which would stand them in good stead with the Divine Judge.<sup>45</sup> One such fast was, apparently, in process of observance amongst the Pharisees and John's disciples, when certain came to Jesus, and asked why His disciples (and He would Himself, of course, fall under the same stricture) did not observe the same rule?<sup>46</sup> The force of Jesus' answer depends upon the custom which prohibited the disturbance of a marriage function for any cause whatsoever; a custom which was probably grounded in some theory of ill-luck, likely to follow from an association, at such a time, with things *tabu*<sup>47</sup>. Thus, in particular, no notice was to be taken, at the time, of the death of a relative, should such an event occur; an injunction which is parallel to the rule which

<sup>45</sup> The only fast prescribed by the Law was the Day of Atonement. To this was added the New Year, Num. xxix. 1 (Ps. lxxxi. 3); and, later, the four fasts mentioned in Zech. viii. 19, and the Fast of Esther (cf. Esth. iv. 3, 16; ix. 31). There were, in addition, many private fasts, and it appears that strict Pharisees observed every Monday and Thursday as a fast day. cf. Lk. xviii. 12: "I fast twice in the week." See Schürer, *H.J.P.* II. ii. pp. 118, 119. Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.* pp. 430-435. In the "*Didaché*" occurs the following passage, in connection with a fast prescribed in preparation for baptism:—Αἱ δὲ νηστεῖαι ὑμῶν μὴ ἔστωσαν μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν· νηστεύουσι γὰρ δευτέρα σαββάτων καὶ πέμπτη· ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε τετράδα καὶ παρασκευήν (viii.).

<sup>46</sup> See appended note

<sup>47</sup> See appended note



prescribed that a priest was, in no circumstances, permitted to mourn, or come in contact with a dead body,<sup>48</sup> except it were his nearest of kin. So here, Jesus' disciples stand in a similar relation to Him, as do the "sons of the bride-chamber" to the bridegroom; and the years of Jesus' ministry are parallel to the days of the wedding festivities.<sup>49</sup> Thus the disciples could not be expected to practise any such austerities, as marked the religious life of the pious Pharisee for instance, while they are in His company. The second part of the answer, referring to the fasting in the days when the bridegroom is taken away, would lose its point if it were to be construed as a prophecy of mourning for Jesus' death. The point is, rather, that when the peculiar association of the moment, in a sort of wedding function, should be terminated, the normal round of life, with its obligations of fasting and its occasions of mourning, would naturally be resumed.

2. Now this analogy serves very well to bring out the contrast in spirit between Jesus and the Baptist. Association with Jesus excuses all ascetic observances, because He is the Bridegroom; the expression being used, in this place, in no symbolical sense, but simply by way of metaphor, to convey the implication that Jesus is in some way distinct from other religious teachers. The Baptist, on the other hand,

<sup>48</sup> See appended note

<sup>49</sup> See appended note

though he has his marks of originality, is in this respect to be classed with all other spiritual leaders of men, as for instance with the Pharisees; and his practice, and that of his disciples, must conform to the same standards. In other words, the personality of John is not other than that of the general run of mankind, though he be a prophet. As his baptism is not sacramental, so his person is in no way divine. And the words seem also to contain this further implication; that while other religious movements, which do not look to a fellowship with Jesus, must of necessity be ascetic in spirit; that of Jesus, on the other hand, is emphatically opposed in principle to this ascetic character. It would be outside the argument of this essay to attempt a justification of the foregoing statement; to exhibit, for instance, the world-weariness or world-contempt of other religious systems, which shows itself, at least theoretically, in various forms of asceticism; and to contrast this with the *joie de vivre* and optimistic humanitarianism of Christianity, to which asceticism in all its forms is an alien accretion; or to prove that the provisions of Christian discipline are in no sense ascetic, but the path to self-culture and the fulness of life. It is sufficient here for us to notice this novel claim for a new religion, and to mark the incidental proposition by Jesus, that He is *sui generis*.

3. The remarks upon the new cloth being fitted to an old cloak, and the new wine being

placed in old wine-skins, only serve to develop this position of the freedom, and spontaneous growth, of the new religion on non-ascetical lines. The parables may be naturally interpreted, as follows. The religious ideas, of the Pharisees and the Baptist alike, which find their expression in asceticism, are an out-worn system, to be laid aside like a thread-bare cloak. Jesus did not come, nor was it possible that any revivalistic leader should come, to patch it up, and give it a new lease of life, by laying new and greater emphasis upon the doctrines of asceticism. The attempt to do so would only the more clearly reveal the weakness and ineffectiveness of a religion, which had come to be little more than a cold formalism; and, further, it would be bound to impair the vitality of Jesus' own teaching, which directly attacked the heart and conscience; "there is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man."<sup>50</sup> The point of the parable is this; that while Judaism had come to rest almost entirely in the outwardness of things, Jesus attempted to conduct men from the outward to the inward, which was immeasurably more important. The second of the two parables starts with the inwardness of religion, and shows that the spiritual experience of men moulds its own outward expression, which indeed it cannot

<sup>50</sup> See appended note

dispense with. Judaism had once possessed an inwardness, of which the Mosaic Law was a fitting expression. But that inwardness had gone, while the form still lingered as a meaningless survival. The religion Jesus preached was a breaking of new ground, a vast spiritual realm as yet unexplored, like a new wine still unfermented which requires room for expansion. It was as impossible to confine the new ideas in the old forms, as to put an unfermented wine in a skin which had worn thin. For the new ideas are necessarily destructive to the old forms, or institutions, to which they are in no way related; and the new ideas are bound to be wasted and lost, unless they are given the opportunity to do their own constructive work. And so the new religious force, which Jesus originates, must be creative of its outward embodiment. Asceticism is no vehicle of Christian truth, which seeks for itself some fitter expression of its inherent vitality.<sup>51</sup> In Luke the two parables are rounded off with what may probably be a proverbial saying; "No man having drunk old wine desireth new: for he saith, The old is good." The saying introduces a fresh idea. Hitherto we have been thinking of the old skins of Judaism, in connection with the new wine of Christianity, the perishing forms and the invigorating spirit. Now we are reminded that there is an old wine, a survival of the old piety which can still inform the archaic institutions

<sup>51</sup> See appended note.

with a measure of real life. The new spirit comes face to face with a doughty opponent in this old piety; and the saying serves as a warning of the very real difficulty which the new ideas are bound to encounter in their attempt to supplant the old, particularly amongst those persons who have actually found life, and a measure of self-expression for their spiritual experience, in the old. It suggests that a sort of discontent, or dissatisfaction with the old, must invariably precede the adoption of the new; and that, in some cases, the prospect of the success of the new teaching is hopeless.<sup>52</sup>

4. It is probable that Luke inserted this verse as a kind of *apologia* for the Baptist. For the contrast thus emphasised by Jesus, in His answer and in the two parables, not between Himself and the Pharisees only, but also between Himself and John, seems to reveal the two parting company. The Baptist, though he was the prophet of the new, was himself of the old dispensation. He belonged, body and soul, to that which was destined to die out. It is possible that, as Matthew has it, he had himself sent his disciples to put to Jesus the question about fasting. But, however that may be, he was con-

<sup>52</sup> The proverb may be compared with that in Jn. ii. 10. The idea of the new supplanting the old is worked out in the following passages, in its Legal and Moral aspects:—Ro. vii. 6; Eph. iv. 22-24; Col. iii. 9, 10; Heb. viii. 13. See Hort, "*Judaistic Christianity*," pp. 23, 24. Weiss, "*Life of Christ*," vol. ii. pp. 136-138.

tent to retain his old methods, to live in the past, and to forego that association with Jesus which might have brought him new light. He who had been the Friend of the Bridegroom never became a son of the bride-chamber; he negotiated the marriage, and heralded the nuptials, but he never sat as a guest at the wedding feast.

## V

### JOHN AND THE ELIJAH

(Mt. xi. 2-19; Lk. vii. 18-28; xvi. 16; vii. 29-35.)

1. We may now pass on to the consideration of three passages, in connection with which we shall discuss, together with other points, the question of the identification of John with the Elijah of prophecy. And first of all we shall take the incident of the question addressed by John to Jesus, relative to His Messiahship, with its immediate context, as related by Matthew and Luke.<sup>53</sup> According to Matthew, it was from his prison that John sent his disciples to Jesus. The accuracy of the words "in the prison" may reasonably be doubted. It would indeed have been strange if such liberty of intercourse with his friends had been permitted to a political offender; and if Machærus was indeed the place of the Baptist's incarceration, both the distance from the scene of Jesus' activities, and its position as a frontier fortress in troublous times, would seem to preclude such a supposi-

<sup>53</sup> See appended note

tion. The words probably rest upon an ill-founded tradition; and we may take it that John despatched his disciples while he was yet engaged in his own ministry, either because he was too busily occupied to come himself, or because a certain delicacy of feeling restrained him from seeking a personal interview with Jesus. Matthew also tells us that John had heard "the works of the Christ"; words which we may certainly regard as editorial. But it is worth noticing that the article emphasises the fact that Jesus was certainly, in the view of the narrator, the Messiah; and that in this way he introduces us to the implication of John's question<sup>54</sup>: "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" Obviously the Baptist intended the Messiah by his "he that cometh"; and, equally certainly, the works of Jesus had hitherto not been of a character to satisfy him that He was that Messiah. We may trace in his words a fear lest he had been too precipitate, lest he had been mistaken in his previous judgment. Perhaps John was not merely disappointed that Jesus did not, in his opinion, act as the Messiah should; but was also led into betraying some anxiety, consequent upon the apparent failure of his prophecies, lest he should himself lose credit with the people. He had, in season and out of season, proclaimed the advent of Messiah; and still there was no sign of His appearing! What would be the end of it? But, however this may

<sup>54</sup> See appended note



be, we should at the same time notice the personal confidence which sends him to Jesus Himself in his perplexity; as being sure of this, that the Master would not claim to be who He was not.

2. The answer Jesus returns is, at first sight, astonishing in its ambiguity. According to Luke, He first performs a series of His usual miracles before the astonished gaze of John's disciples; and then, on the authority of Matthew also, He sends them back with an account of the works He was accomplishing, added to which was a benediction upon him whose faith should not stumble.<sup>55</sup> Now Jesus' words, though they are not a quotation, are undoubtedly a recollection of *Isaiah lxi. 1, 2*, which was usually interpreted in a Messianic sense; a passage, moreover, which was taken, so Luke records, as a text for the sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth, at the commencement of His ministry, and was then given a distinct Messianic flavour.<sup>56</sup> Observing this, we may take it that Jesus' answer is capable of being paraphrased as follows; "The works which you have heard that I do are, you must allow, the very works predicted of the Messiah in the book of *Isaiah*.

<sup>55</sup> Streeter points out (in *Ox. Studies*, p. 427) that it is a characteristic of Q to make the Kingdom a present fact, growing up into a future actualisation; and that it accords with this that Jesus should be represented as offering tokens of His Messianic office, though His Messiahship is only realised in the future Kingdom.

<sup>56</sup> Lk. iv. 18, 19.

Beyond that I can say nothing. My works must testify of Me; and you must form your own judgment upon them. Only, you will indeed be blessed, if your personal faith and confidence in Me, whatever your final opinion as to My office, remains unchanged." The last words will then provide us with a key to the ambiguity of the answer. Jesus never attempted to force the opinion of any man. Of this we have evidence in the story of the Temptation, where He refused to cast Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple. He always looked for a clear-cut moral judgment, unfettered and unbiassed. For this reason, amongst others, He never openly proclaimed His Messiahship, but preferred to speak of Himself always in the third person as the "Son of Man."<sup>57</sup> So here, He probably felt that the Baptist must be left free to form his own conclusions upon the evidence presented to him, in accordance with the bent of his mind. It would not really have been helpful to him, to have had as direct and uncompromising an answer as he prayed for; for if Jesus had replied in the affirmative, and John had still been unable to dispel his doubts, his condition would have then been infinitely more harassing. We have, in short, in this passage, an instance of that subtle power of penetration into the working of others' minds, which we are always being called upon to admire in Jesus.

### 3. On the departure of the Baptist's disciples,

<sup>57</sup> See appended note

with the message to their master, Jesus turns to the assembled crowd, and discusses with them the personality of John. Jesus' character studies are always intensely illuminative; here is one of them. With true Oriental dialectic, He singles out, one by one, the principal features in that character. John was not "a reed shaken with the wind," a mere crazy fanatic, who would quickly be overthrown and perish; but a strong, upright, forcible and unpliant man. He was not "a man clothed in soft raiment," a mere courtier with amiable religious views, a philosophic humbug; but a downright, earnest man, of rugged austerity of life. He was a man whose intense conviction and burning eloquence showed him to have a real message to the world, proved him to be sent by God, proclaimed him a prophet. And, more than that, he was not merely one of the old line of prophets, whom popular opinion supposed to have been extinguished; but, rather, he was the greatest of them all, the forerunner or herald of the King who was to come, the messenger of the Anointed, peculiarly honoured by reason of his immediate connection with Messiah.<sup>58</sup> And,

<sup>58</sup> Mk. i. 2 has the quotation from Mal. iii. 1, which Mt. and Lk. incorporate here. None of the three Synoptists give it as it appears in Heb. or LXX. In Mk. and Q it appeared in an independent Greek form, stereotyped as one of the commonplaces of Messianic prophecy. cf. Plummer, "*St. Luke*," p. 204. It is probable that Mk. was here indebted to Q, conflating his two quotations from that source. cf. "*Ox. Studies*," p. 168.

further, the office which he had come to fill, singled him out as being the most ennobled of all human beings. He was, in short, as we have it on Matthew's authority, the Elijah returned to earth, in accordance with the prophecy of Malachi.<sup>59</sup>

4. We may turn for a moment, from this panegyric of the Baptist, to consider the two interpolated verses of Luke, which mar the sequence of thought somewhat less, if introduced here, than they would do elsewhere. "All the people," we are told, including the publicans, who had been baptised by John, when they heard Jesus' remarks upon the Baptist, "justified God." This must mean an acknowledgment, on their part, that they received John's baptism as preparatory to the Messianic baptism at the inauguration of the Kingdom; consequently they were ready to accept Jesus' identification of the Baptist with Elijah, and to profess their consciousness of God's righteousness and wisdom in having so sent His messenger to herald the Messiah.<sup>60</sup> The Pharisees and Scribes, on the other hand, who had refused to be baptised by John, had thereby "rejected for themselves the counsel of God." In other words, the intentions of God were rendered, in their case, ineffective by the attitude they assumed; John's mission had not touched their consciences, and they were unlikely to accept his identification with Elijah which Jesus proposed. It is possible that what

<sup>59</sup> See appended note

<sup>60</sup> See appended note

Luke means to imply here is that the tradition (Mt. iii. 7), which brought Pharisees to John's baptism, must not be understood as meaning that they received baptism. They would doubtless have come only in a spirit of curiosity; or have been deterred by John's very outspoken criticism of them, if, in a vein of self-righteous confidence in their Abrahamic paternity, they had sought to dispense with the confession of sin.<sup>61</sup> This passage in Luke finds its parallel in words, recorded by Matthew, which Jesus addressed to the Pharisees at a later period in His ministry; "Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the Kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye saw it, did not even repent yourselves afterwards, that ye might believe him."<sup>62</sup> John came as a teacher of righteousness; he not

<sup>61</sup> Compare Jn. viii. 33-44, as giving in an idealised form the Pharisaic conception of righteousness, which did not imply either a consciousness of sin, or lofty moral conceptions. *נקדש* originally meant fidelity to a faithful God, a form of patriotism; but in later Jewish history, with a more or less realised theocracy, and the eclipse of nationalist aspirations, it came, under *sabbatical* influences, to mean fidelity to the *Torah*. John resuscitated the strictly moral conceptions which the old prophets had endowed it with; and *δικαιοσύνη* represents this last development, implying that which is right, rather than that which is customary.

<sup>62</sup> Mt. xxi. 31<sup>b</sup>, 32. Allen, "*St. Matthew*," p. 227, clearly shows that these words are not editorial; but Lk. vii. 29, 30, may be founded upon a reminiscence

only taught, but embodied and exemplified what he taught. To this teaching the publicans and harlots, the despised outcasts of society, responded; while the Pharisees not only gave no reception to his teaching, but, when they saw these outcasts profiting by it, they set themselves still more determinedly against it. Thus the publicans and harlots actually pass into the present moral Kingdom of God, while there is no sign of the Pharisees, their supposed religious superiors, doing so.<sup>63</sup>

5. But we return to Matthew's account, where Jesus resumes and discusses with His audience the relation of the Baptist to the Kingdom. It will be, perhaps, easier to grasp what this is if we transpose the verses in which it is described. Thus, in the first place, "all the prophets and the law prophesied until John"; or, in other words, the whole range of prophetic scripture<sup>64</sup> foretold the Kingdom as an ideal, to be realised at some future, but unspecified, date; but John announces its immediate inauguration in the person of the Messiah; not indeed that he preached the Kingdom, but the King who would bring it. Thus the Baptist was the last, the culminating point, in the succession of

of them. They are very conveniently attached to the parable in Mt. xxi. 28-31<sup>4</sup>; but there is no connection with Mt. xxi. 23-27. The character of the words suggests that they were addressed to the Pharisees.

<sup>63</sup> See appended note

<sup>64</sup> The Law is also prophetic of the Messiah, peculiarly on its sacrificial side.

Israel's prophets, and in him both Law and Prophecy had reached their destined term. Then, "from the days of John the Baptist until now, the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force." In Luke's narrative this passage appears in another context as, "from that time the gospel of the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it." A difficult grammatical question arises from a comparison of these two versions of the same saying; but probably there is no substantial difference in the sense they are intended to convey.<sup>65</sup> John, it appears, was the last and the greatest of the prophets, because he not only announced the Kingdom in the person of the Messiah, but actually led men into it. He was himself, too, the fulfilment of prophecy; a thing which could be said of no other prophet that had hitherto appeared. Now, since he began to preach, some years before the opening of Jesus' ministry, until now, when that ministry was well advanced, and that of John was virtually closed; men had actually been entering the Kingdom which the prophets foretold, being transferred from the leadership and baptism of John to that of Jesus. The Baptist's preaching of repentance, and of the baptism of the Spirit which the Messiah would convey, had awakened, or created, an enthusiasm which was infectious. Those who came on to Jesus realised that the Kingdom was not a treasure put into

<sup>65</sup> See appended note

their hands, without an effort being made on their part to appropriate it; but, rather, that it was like a citadel which must be stormed and taken. If repentance was to be the condition of entering the Kingdom, then the effects, or "fruits worthy of repentance," must be seen in strenuous labour in well-doing, and in an intense hunger and thirst after that righteousness, which, above everything else, is to characterise the Kingdom when it is set up. And last, "he that is but little in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he." In other words, he who enters the Kingdom, though his position therein may be quite insignificant, is nevertheless greater, in that respect, even than he who announces the Kingdom, and, perhaps only half-consciously, leads men into it. Thus, those who come to Jesus through the preaching of the Baptist, are greater than the Baptist's self; presumably because John is, in this life, kept from Jesus, and excluded from the Kingdom, by the pressure of his doubts as to Jesus' Messiahship. There is a touch of sadness in the saying, which precludes us from weakening its force as a criticism of John's position. But there is no inconsistency, in this saying, with Jesus' previous summary of the Baptist's character. He was eminently a strong man, with the deep-rooted conviction of the truth and adequacy of his message which belonged to the typical prophet. But his strength was also his weakness. He never wavered in his unfaltering adherence to the belief that the Day



of the Lord, and with it the Messiah, must quickly appear; but he was the victim of the preconceptions which defined for him the nature of the Messiah's office and work. He did not lose, as we have seen, his personal attachment to Jesus; but, like many a strong man,<sup>66</sup> he trusted his enthusiasms; and the spiritual perception which seemed to him an adequate basis for his assumption that Jesus was the Messiah at the time of the baptism, would have been liable to be dissipated in the cold light of reason, when he seemed to observe that the proper signs of Messiahship were not forthcoming. And Jesus attaches no blame to what was the result of the Baptist's misfortune, when He notes with a pathetic earnestness the failure of His messenger to rise above his intellectual heritage; while for John's person He ever expresses the highest admiration.

6. To return to the passages under consideration; Jesus concludes His discussion of the Baptist, by contrasting him with Himself, on lines very similar to those we have already examined in the illustration of the Bridegroom and His friends. The contrast is introduced in a parable, which appears to have been spoken directly to the Pharisees.<sup>66</sup> He glances at the

<sup>66</sup> Mt. xi. 16<sup>a</sup>=Lk. vii. 31; is a common formula for introducing a parable in the *Midrashim*. cf. Allen, "St. Matthew," p. 119. Lk.'s λέγετε (vii. 33, 34) shows that those to whom it was addressed were present; and, since "the men of this generation" must include Jesus and John, to accord with the sense of the parable (cf.

woeful ineffectiveness of the preaching of both of them, in their relation to the orthodox piety of one section of their hearers. They have been like children in the bazaars, who have tried to entice their fellows to various games, mimic marriage festivities or mimic funeral processions, but without success; "we piped unto you, and ye did not dance; we wailed, and ye did not beat the breast." Their playmates did not choose to have anything to do with them; they were not to be pleased, but scoffed, and derided these futile pretences. In the same manner, there were those who rejected John's preaching of repentance, and roughly called his asceticism dæmoniacal; while they resented Jesus' proclamation of the gospel of forgiveness, and sneered at His sociability as being a cloak to moral laxity. Both John and Jesus taught ideals of righteousness, clothed in different outward garb, which the Pharisees could not bring themselves to view with any shred of sympathy; and their unsympathetic attitude was expressed with biting scorn. The view that it is the Pharisees whom Jesus is addressing in the parable, and that it is their lack of responsiveness to His own teaching and the Baptist's which is under discussion, will help us to a consistent interpretation of the following words, which are undoubtedly the most difficult Plummer, "*St. Luke*," p. 206), we may take it that the children who refused to laugh or mourn were represented by their religious leaders as their spokesmen, viz., the Pharisees, to whom the new religious leaders would naturally appeal in the first instance.

in the whole passage: "Wisdom has been justified by all her children."<sup>67</sup> 'Wisdom,' here, seems to be that self-sufficient righteousness of, for instance, the typical Pharisee; which sets itself against the introduction of new religious forces and motives, which it does not care to understand. 'To justify,' is simply to prove right; or, in other words, to support, by any captious and shallow arguments or assertions which appear to be sufficient for the purpose, the attitude adopted. And 'the children of wisdom' are, thus, just those whose frame of mind this describes. We may, then, paraphrase as follows:—"Those self-righteous people, sufficient in their own narrow wisdom, who have dubbed John 'possessed,' and Jesus 'dissolute,' can always be depended upon to furnish, as they have done in this instance, what they call their reasons for rejecting religious claims and principles, which they do not choose to examine." This appears to have the merit of clinching the force of what has gone before, in the parable addressed to the Pharisees, and of thus bringing the whole passage to a fitting conclusion.

(Mk. vi. 14-16; Mt. xiv. 1, 2; Lk. ix. 7-9.)

7. The second of the three passages in which the Elijah appears, now claims our attention. It is the account given us of Herod's opinion of Jesus, which prefaces the narrative of the martyrdom of the Baptist. It appears that the

<sup>67</sup> See appended note

diffusion of the new religious movement, by the sending out of the Twelve, first directed the attention of Antipas towards it. Herod heard of this mission, Mark tells us; and by means of it the name of Jesus achieved a measure of notoriety. Perhaps we may comment upon this by remarking, that it was only after John's death that Jesus came prominently before the public eye; for if Jesus had attained any popularity during the period of John's ministry, it would have been impossible that the rumour, which we are to consider, could have arisen. We may also conjecture that Jesus had, by this time, felt impelled towards some such capital action as the Baptist had expected of Him, owing to the slight effect His preaching had, so far, produced. According to Mark,<sup>68</sup> Herod, on hearing of Jesus, exclaimed: "John the Baptist is risen from the dead, and therefore the Powers are active in him!"<sup>69</sup> And when others ventured the opinion, "It is Elijah!" or "A Prophet, like one of the prophets!" he only stated his feeling, the prompting of a guilty conscience, the more emphatically; "John, whom I beheaded, he is risen!" Matthew depends upon Mark in this passage, only omitting the opinions contrary to Herod's. But Luke sets the matter in a different

<sup>68</sup> Westcott and Hort have adopted ἔλεγον for ἔλεγεν in Mk. vi. 14. The reading in Mt. is certainly ἔλεγεν; and the construction in Mk. would favour the rejection of ἔλεγον. "And King Herod heard . . . and he said . . . But Herod, when he heard, said . . ."

<sup>69</sup> See appended note

light. According to him, it was not Herod himself, but those who carried the report of Jesus to him who started the rumour that Jesus was the risen Baptist. He also mentions the other hypotheses: "Elijah has appeared!" and "One of the old prophets has risen again!" But he expressly asserts that the first explanation "much perplexed" Herod, who strove to combat the idea; "John I beheaded; but who is this about whom I hear such things?" While utterly at a loss, he could not but regard the rumour as absurd. Luke adds that "he sought to see him;" not, surely, to satisfy himself as to whether or not the rumour were true, but simply because he was curious. We may compare the statement with the account Luke gives (xxiii. 8.) of the so-called trial by Herod: "Now when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he was of a long time desirous to see him, because he had heard concerning him; and he hoped to see some miracle done by him." We must feel that Luke's narrative has the two-fold merit of probability and consistency. In the first place, Herod was a Sadducee,<sup>70</sup> and would not have held to a

<sup>70</sup> The question as to the disbelief of the Sadducees in the immortality of the soul will be discussed later. The statement that Antipas was a Sadducee, while probable on other grounds, seems clearly to be supported by the fact that Mk. viii. 15, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod," makes a clear distinction between two opposite tendencies, the latter of which is identified in Mt. xvi. 6, 11, with the Sadducees though the sense of differentiation is there obliterated.

belief in the immortality of the soul; moreover he would have been sceptical about Jesus' power to perform miracles. And, in the second place, ~~his~~ attitude towards Jesus at the trial was not what it would have been, had he really had a suspicion that this was John, re-embodied; and, further, we gather from the narrative in *Lk. xiii. 31, 32*, that Herod had already attempted to kill Jesus, or had expressed a wish that he might do so, before he had ever seen Him.

8. That such a rumour should have got about is not at all incredible. The animistic notions, which are always deep-rooted in more primitive civilisations, and the less educated minds of all countries and times, credit the departed spirit with an access of power, simply because it is presumed to be independent of the limitations of physical life. Such a spirit is not only able to assume any form it pleases, but is generally possessed of a disposition to wreak its vengeance upon those who have provoked it in this life. A belief of this kind fully accounts for the terror with which the ghosts of the dead are ordinarily invested.<sup>71</sup> John Baptist had done no miracles, we are told, during his earthly ministry;<sup>72</sup> but his

<sup>71</sup> See, for instance, Waitz, "*Anthropology*," pp. 371, 372; Tylor, "*Primitive Culture*," vol. ii. pp. 27-29. The body of the Baptist had been buried, and one class of evils was eliminated in his case; but the ghost which must be placated was not necessarily tied down to the corpse and grave. Hence the various ritual for "laying" ghosts.

<sup>72</sup> Jn. x. 41. Ἰωάννης μὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδέν.

re-embodied spirit would certainly exhibit a thaumaturgic power. A conjecture may be hazarded, that the very generally expressed opinion that the Baptist was risen from the dead, may have rested upon something he himself said, now lost to us, in the latter part of his career. If he felt, as no doubt he would have done in his disappointment as to Jesus' Messiahship, that his own mission was still unaccomplished, and that he had yet to relivise that close connection with the great Day, of which he stood convinced; it is quite possible that ~~he~~ he would have believed, and declared his belief, that he would again appear, to vindicate in other circumstances the truth of that conviction.

9. But the question to which we should particularly address ourselves is this:—"Why was it that some, at least, of Jesus' contemporaries were disposed to identify Him with the Elijah?" In attempting to answer this question, we may first notice that John Baptist was not recognised as the Elijah in his life-time, whether by his own disciples, or even by Jesus.<sup>73</sup> These rumours about Jesus, for instance, seem to exclude that supposition. Not, judging from the evidence of our records, did John believe himself to be the Elijah. Not only do our sources of information represent him as quite unconscious of the fact; but they lead us to

<sup>73</sup> See Note 59, where we have already had occasion to doubt whether Mt. xi. 14 belongs to the occasion of its context.

imagine that it was his custom to speak of himself, in the impersonal prophetic phrase, as "A voice crying in the wilderness." It is practically certain that he realised a vocation as a prophet; but there was little in his character and teaching which would accord with the later rabbinical doctrine of Elijah, much of which may have been current in his day.<sup>74</sup> But it remains that Jesus Himself was the first to hail John as Elijah; and that not in public, but as an esoteric doctrine, imparted to a few disciples, after the Baptist's death. These disciples accepted Jesus' verdict; the report spread and gained currency; and the general consent of succeeding Christian generations acquiesced in according to the Baptist that title. Then we may notice, in this connection, the answer rendered to Jesus' question at Cæsarea Philippi; a question which elicited from Peter the confession of his Master's Messiahship.<sup>75</sup> "John the Baptist," it runs in Mark; "and others Elijah; and others that (thou art) one of the prophets." Luke has, for the last clause, the following variation; "but others, that a certain prophet of those of old is risen again;" and Matthew, "and others again, Jeremiah or one of

<sup>74</sup> • See appended note

<sup>75</sup> Mk. viii. 28. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν, καὶ ἄλλοι Ἡλείαν ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι εἰς τῶν προφητῶν. Mt. xvi. 14. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἡλείαν, ἕτεροι δὲ Ἰερεμίαν ἢ ἕνα τῶν προφητῶν. Lk. ix. 19. οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπαν Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἡλείαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι προφητὴς τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη,



the prophets." It may very plausibly be argued that the passage we are considering is a duplication of this; and that the information, as to rumours about Jesus' identity, belongs only to the incident at Cæsarea Philippi. This supposition rests, in part, upon the dubious historicity of the account of the Baptist's imprisonment and death, which we shall presently examine. But, however this may be, we shall do well to glance, in passing, at the expectation in men's minds, which these passages exhibit, of the return, not merely of the Elijah, but of other prophets also. The expectation of the advent of Elijah is found in *Ecclus. xlvi. 10*; "who was recorded for reproofs in their seasons, to pacify anger, before it break forth into wrath; to turn the heart of the father unto the son, and to restore the tribes of Jacob;" a passage obviously based upon *Mal. iv. 5, 6*. Since Elijah had not died, his reappearance was an easy and natural inference; a remark which also applies to Enoch and Moses.<sup>76</sup> The expectation of Jeremiah may be founded upon *2 Macc. xv. 13-16*, where that prophet is made to appear, in company with Onias, in a vision to Judas Maccabee. In *4 Ezra ii. 18*, God promises to send Isaiah and Jeremiah to Jerusalem, in the

<sup>76</sup> See "*Assumption of Moses*," xii. 6, "The Lord hath on their behalf appointed me to pray for their sins and make intercession for them," i.e. after his assumption. This illustrates the close connection which was supposed to exist between the prophets and their people, together with an abiding interest in their people's fortunes.

days of her distress.<sup>77</sup> Then we have the passage in *Deut. xviii. 15*; "the Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken;" the expectation of which<sup>78</sup> is found reflected in *1 Macc. iv. 46*; *xiv. 41*, "the prophet that should come," "the faithful prophet." In *John vii. 40, 41*, this prophet is distinguished from the Messiah; as he is also in *Jn. vi. 14*, "This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world."<sup>79</sup> The feeling that underlies all this, seems to have been that, in the hour of Israel's greatest need, that is in the tribulation before the great Day of the Lord, God would raise up from the dead and cause to

<sup>77</sup> This passage does not betray the Christian influences, which are obviously at work in, for instance, *4 Ez. vii. 28, 29*.

<sup>78</sup> Driver, "*Deuteronomy*," pp. 227-229, points out that it is not a particular prophet, but a permanent institution, a recurring phenomenon, which is here in view. But the Jews, doubtless, felt that they needed an ideal realisation of the prophetic character in a particular individual, such as none of the old prophets had completely, or permanently, satisfied.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. *Jn. i. 21*. In *Ac. iii. 22*; *vii. 37*, on the other hand, *Deut. xviii. 15* is taken to be Messianic. Notice that in *Mt. xxi. 11*, "This is the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee," Jesus is identified with the Prophet by the crowd. Possibly the meaning here is Elijah; and we must delete, as editorial, "the son of David," from *Mt. xxi. 9*. Possibly the tradition, recorded in *Mt. xxvii. 52, 53*, of the resuscitation of many saints at the death of Jesus, is an attempt to satisfy this craving for the appearance of the old prophets, which seems to have been prevalent.

appear, for her comfort and stay, the great outstanding spiritual forces of the past. That John Baptist should so quickly have found a place in this category, is a witness to the extraordinarily powerful effect his preaching must have had upon the minds and hearts of those whom he addressed; and, perhaps we may add, suggests that the preaching, in order to achieve such a success, must have extended over a far longer period of time than the evangelical record seems to imply.

10. It can be no exaggeration to say that, so far as our sources give us any clear information on the subject, the expectation of the Elijah was very much more pronounced in the popular mind of John's day, than was the expectation of the Messiah. It is peculiarly true of the apocalyptic literature, and a generalisation may be hazarded to the effect that, the figure of Messiah had, from the spiritualising and imaginative treatment to which it had been subjected, come to assume such colossal and super-human proportions, that He had sunk very far into the dim mystery of a religious back-ground, similarly to the chthonic gods of Greece; while men's minds seized the more readily upon the more material personalities of the old prophets. Then, too, historical eschatology placed the appearance of Elijah, not in direct connection with the revelation of Messiah, but previous to the 'Tribulation' which was to usher in the great Day; while Messiah and His Kingdom was to be anticipated

only after that catastrophe. Thus, while the people would have awaited the coming of Elijah, it would never have occurred to them to expect Messiah in the historical setting of the present age. He belonged to the future. And if they had not identified the Baptist with Elijah, still less would they have been disposed to connect Jesus with the Messianic idea. While, on the other hand, since they had failed to see in John the traits of the Elijah, the Baptist's testimony to Jesus, as the mightier One who was to come, might well have prepared them to see the ideal prophet represented in the new Teacher. Be that as it may, there can be no doubt that popular opinion, while it never dreamed of associating John with the Elijah, was very emphatically in favour of identifying Jesus with one or other of the old prophets, whose appearance would herald the Tribulation; while it never hinted at the greater possibility that He was Messiah. But popular opinion was, undoubtedly, confused and divided. There was little, perhaps, peculiar to Jesus' work and teaching, which would enable men to recognise in Him the characteristics of the Elijah; and therefore it was that Jeremiah, or Isaiah, or another prophet like unto Moses, would be seized upon as the appropriate type of His life and doctrine. It would take us too far afield to discuss here the large question of Jesus' Messianic consciousness, or even to glance at the incidents of the ride into Jerusalem, and the trial before Caiaphas, which

have such an important bearing upon the subject. But it may be stated, with some degree of confidence, that the Messiahship which Jesus claimed had no place in this earthly life of His, but belonged entirely to the future. In other words, He, the lowly Son of Man, the Prophet, the Suffering Servant, claimed that, after the passion which He should endure for men,<sup>80</sup> He would be revealed as the Messiah of Israel, and would then inaugurate His Kingdom. If we allow this, we vindicate the apocalyptic theory of a Messianic reign, which would owe its beginning to the coming of the Day; of which the Elijah was to be the immediate prophet; and we justify, in a measure, both the reluctance of the people at the trials to see in the very human Jesus a present Messiah, and the speculative opinion of the same populace at other times, which claimed Him as the Elijah, or one of the prophets which were of old.<sup>81</sup>

(Mk. ix. 2-13; Mt. xvii. 1-13; Lk. ix. 28-36.)

II. The last of the three passages which introduce the Elijah, is the account of the Transfiguration; which we shall now proceed to examine.<sup>82</sup> In this narrative, the important points for us to notice are, first the appearance of Moses and Elijah talking with Jesus; typifying, the one Law, and the other Prophecy. Then

<sup>80</sup> Jesus' death was a baptism of consecration to His Messianic office. cf. Scott, "*The Kingdom and the Messiah*," p. 243.

<sup>81</sup> See appended note

<sup>82</sup> See appended note

the words, "This is my Son, the Beloved; hear ye Him;" which imply that Jesus was at once the fulfilment and the end of both Law and Prophecy; that in future men must no longer seek to Moses and Elijah for guidance, but to Jesus only. And, last, the disappearance of the other two figures, leaving Jesus alone with the disciples; which gave practical effect to the words. Mark and Matthew go on to tell us that, on the way down from the mountain, Jesus charged His disciples "that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of Man should have risen again from the dead." And Mark naïvely adds, that they did not in the least understand what Jesus meant by the rising again from the dead. Now it is obvious, in the first place, that the disciples had not grasped the lesson which the Transfiguration was intended to teach, the lesson, that is to say, of His future Messiahship; in the second place, that Jesus did not expect them to understand it, until His Resurrection to the Messianic dignity should give an effective force to His life and teaching; and, in the third place, that He charged them to keep the vision of the Transfiguration, with its Messianic disclosure, to themselves, until they should have discovered its significance. But the appearance of Elijah naturally started in the disciples' minds a train of thought, which finds its expression in the following question; "Why then," as Matthew has it, "say the Scribes that Elijah must first come?"

The official teaching of the Scribes was to the effect that Elijah would return for the express purpose of preparing the way for the Messiah. This was not based upon *Mal. iv. 5*, which speaks of Elijah only in connection with "the great and terrible day of the Lord;" words which are not Messianic except in a secondary sense, that is by implication. But Scribal tradition, as we have seen, had considerably developed the prophetic forecast of Elijah's appearance. But perhaps we may narrow down the issue before the disciples' minds. They had just been forbidden to speak to others of the amazing disclosure, which they had failed to understand, of their Master's Messiahship; they felt that the charge precluded any discussion with Himself; the matter was, for the time being, closed. But they could give their attention to a relevant subject, the Day of the Lord, and the connection of Elijah with it. In brief, the question does no more than state this difficulty: "Elijah has appeared to us here and now! How does that affect his promised appearance before the Day of the Lord? Is that Day so close at hand?" Moses and the Law are mentioned side by side with Elijah and Prophecy, in the passage in Malachi; and the appearance of the two would necessarily cause the disciples to revert to that passage. They would have been inclined to ask, "Was this the appearance there prophesied?"

12. Jesus' answer affirms the accuracy of the

prophecy; though He proceeds to give it a Messianic flavour, in the manner of the Scribes. "Elijah," He says, "indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things;" the latter phrase being a condensation of Malachi's (iv. 6<sup>a</sup>) "he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the sons, and the heart of the sons to their fathers;" which appears to mean a social regeneration, an awakening of a sense of reciprocal responsibility. But, according to Mark, Jesus continues, "How is it written of the Son of Man, that he should suffer many things, and be set at nought?" These are difficult words; and at first it is not easy to see their relevancy to the disciples' question. It is nowhere written of the Messiah that He should suffer; but if we bear in mind that Jesus uses the title 'Son of Man' to express the present condition of Him who is to be the Messiah, we shall see that He is here appropriating to Himself the prophetic image of the Suffering-Servant, which probably revealed to Him the divine necessity of His death, before He could realise His Messiahship. But He neither explains to His disciples His understanding of Isaiah; nor does He intimate to them that the drama of the great Day will be played out in His Person. The future will bring its own interpretation of events. But Jesus' words are obviously addressed to at least a partial explanation of the prediction of His passion, which had gone just before. Let us remember that Jesus has affirmed that Elijah must first come; and that He has, moreover,



denied by implication that the appearance in the Transfiguration vision is the coming prophesied ; that He has, by the mention of the Son of Man, brought the advent of Elijah into direct relation with the coming of Messiah ; that He has, moreover, announced that the Son of Man is to rise from the dead, or, in other words, that He must first die ; and, further, that He has told them that the death of the Son of Man is the subject of prophecy. Bearing these things in mind, we may venture to paraphrase His question thus :— “If Elijah is to come before the Son of Man, for the express purpose of preparing the soil for His mission, by bringing about a regeneration of society ; how is it that the Son of Man, when He comes, is nevertheless to be rejected, to suffer, and to die ?” Jesus, in fact, is voicing a difficulty which was bound to arise within the circle of His adherents at a later stage ; and He is dealing with it by anticipation. The words which follow do not indeed propound an answer to the question ; but they indicate the lines upon which that answer must be sought. The mystery of the Passion demands a doctrine of Atonement. Mark has, “Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him ;” and Matthew expands the words, adding an editorial comment : “Elijah is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they listed. Even so shall the Son of Man also suffer of them. Then understood the disciples that he

spake unto them of John the Baptist." We are bound to confess that we are quite in the dark as to what is intended by a prophecy of Elijah's passion. The suggestion that Jezebel's denunciation of vengeance upon the prophet Elijah, which was abortive, after the lapse of centuries claimed its victim in John Baptist, through the machinations of Herodias, another Jezebel, is surely too far-fetched to be convincing.<sup>83</sup> We can only say that the death of Elijah was the subject of a Scribal tradition now lost to us, probably based upon some passage of Scripture which is not clear. But, putting that on one side, the sense of the words appears to be as follows. Jesus' Messiahship belongs to a period subsequent to His death, when He will come again with His Kingdom. There is a distinction between the Messiah and Isaiah's Servant; but the distinction is one, not of person, but of time. That Servant is the present Son of Man, who will, when His time is come, indeed suffer. But the Elijah, who is the herald of His Messiahship, must suffer also; both are to be involved in the same catastrophe. The fate which is to overtake the "mightier One," is also the fate of His forerunner; and indeed, in the person of John Baptist, the fate of the latter is already fallen. The rejection of the Son of Man, also involves the rejection of Elijah; as the mission of the Son of Man lacks its apparent accom-

<sup>83</sup> So Swete, "*St. Mark*," p. 183, who adopts the explanation of Origen.

plishment, in the bringing of the Kingdom; so also does the preparation of that mission by Elijah, in the work of social regeneration. The work of both is, in a temporal sense, to be accounted a complete failure. This is not, as we have already said, in itself an answer to the question which went before; but it suggests an answer to that question. It implies that the sufferings of both Elijah and Son of Man were predetermined; and that these sufferings are, in reality, a fuller accomplishment of their respective missions, than any other eventuality which could have been conjectured. But at that point we broach theological doctrine, of the value of vicarious sacrifice. We have only one other thing to notice in the passage, and that is, that the statement of Jesus to the effect that John was not recognised as Elijah, bears out a conclusion we have previously reached; namely that John was not proclaimed Elijah during his lifetime, whether by the people, his own disciples, or even by Jesus Himself.

## VI.

### THE DEATH OF JOHN.

(Mk. vi. 17-29; Mt. xiv. 3-12; Lk. iii. 19, 20.)

I. We have now to examine the narrative of the circumstances which led immediately to John's<sup>84</sup> imprisonment and execution. Josephus is our authority for certain facts which have their bearing upon this occurrence; and, indeed, the synoptic record must be balanced and checked by a sole reference to the Jewish historian. in

<sup>84</sup> We may notice here the application to John, in the pages of the evangelists, of the terms βαπτιστής and βαπτίζων. Dalman, "*Words of Jesus*," p. 141, can find no possible Aramaic original for the expression; and he concludes that the application of the term "Baptist" must belong to a later Hellenistic environment, and is therefore out of place in the mouths of Jesus and His contemporaries. It is not unlikely that the title originated in Christian circles, with a view to emphasising the true position of John in his relation to Jesus; and that it was afterwards adopted by his disciples, who called themselves Baptists in consequence. If so, the name has a similar history to that of "Christian."

the absence of any other trustworthy guide to the Herodian period. We may first transcribe the passage in which Josephus deals directly with the Baptist. It runs as follows:—"Now, some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment for what he did against John who was called the Baptist. For Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to justice towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism; for baptism would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not in order to expiate some sins, but for the purification of the body; provided that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. Now, when others came in crowds about him (for they were greatly moved by hearing his words), Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise rebellion (for they seemed to do anything he should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause; and not to bring himself into difficulties, by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly he was sent a prisoner, owing to Herod's suspicions, to Machærus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death. Now, the Jews had an opinion that the destruction of this army was sent as a punishment to Herod, and a mark of

God's displeasure to him."<sup>85</sup> The Baptist is introduced into Josephus' narrative incidentally, and is dismissed in very few words; but those words are important for our picture of his career, and must be allowed their due weight. The occasion, of which the historian speaks, was the defeat of Herod's army by Aretas, the Nabatæan King of Petra and father of Antipas' divorced wife, who thus avenged the insult and indignity to which his family had been subjected. That Herod's subjects should have expressed the view ascribed to them is altogether probable, when we remember John's great popularity, his death at Machærus, which was on the confines of Aretas' territory, and the fact that he met his death, according to the synoptic account, for denouncing Herod's relations with the very woman who had ousted Aretas' daughter. Josephus' account of the Baptist's mission of preaching and baptising must be read with some suspicion; and it is very likely that it has been worked over by a Christian hand. It exhibits a sympathetic appreciation which comes strangely from the pen of a Pharisee; and it shows a correctness of understanding which recalls the point of view of Christian tradition. Moreover it is scarcely consistent with the subsequent representation of John, as a turbulent fanatic, whose preaching was likely to be fraught with serious political consequences.<sup>86</sup> It is for this

<sup>85</sup> See appended note

<sup>86</sup> See appended note

aspect of the Baptist's career that we have to make room, if we are to give the actor his place in history. In brief, we must probably admit that the last few weeks of his liberty were spent in laying the foundations, of what might easily have become a revolutionary movement of formidable dimensions, had not Herod's prompt action checked the rising at its inception, by removing the leader. During this brief period, John appears to have collected the multitude of his adherents in the near neighbourhood of Jerusalem, to have fostered amongst them the seeds of rebellion, to have swayed them by his eloquence, and bound them to follow him where he might lead. No wonder, then, that his execution should have had a dramatic effect, creating a soreness and bitterness amongst his followers, thus easily dispersed; a bitterness which found some solace afterwards in Herod's defeat at the hands of Aretas.

2. Herod the Great had a son by Mariamne, daughter of the High Priest Simon, who is known to history by no other than his family, or dynastic, name of Herod. He played no particular part in affairs of State; for though his father had intended him to succeed Antipater, he afterwards blotted him out of his will, for his complicity in a certain court intrigue. He appears to have lived in Rome, in a sort of banishment, where he probably died. He was married, by his father's sanction, to Herodias, the daughter of Aristobulus by Bernice, who

was thus, in a manner, his niece.<sup>87</sup> His half-brother, Antipas, who was already married to a daughter of Aretas, on visiting Herod at Rome, saw and loved Herodias, whom he induced to leave her husband in order to become his wife. The daughter of Aretas, learning his intentions, sought leave to retire to the fortress of Machærus; whence she fled, after Antipas had divorced her, to her father.<sup>88</sup> Herodias had one daughter by her former marriage, named Salome; who, at some date, at present undetermined, was married to Herod Philip, half-brother to Antipas, and *tetrarch* of provinces to the north-east of Antipas' territory of Galilee and Perea. Salome outlived Philip, who died in A.D. 34, and to whom she bore no children; but her second marriage, to Aristobulus, son of Aristobulus and Bernice, and grandson of Herod the Great, proved fruitful.<sup>89</sup> This digression is necessary, in order that we may judge of the historical accuracy of the synoptic tradition.

3. We are now in a position to examine that tradition; and we may begin with a small point, but one which is suggestive; and that is that Mark wrongly calls Antipas "King," whereas his title, as Philip's, was *tetrarch*.<sup>90</sup> Another point is this: that Mark and Matthew agree in

<sup>87</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xvii. 1, 2; 3, 2; xviii. 5, 1. *B.J.* i. 28, 4; 29, 2; 30, 7.

<sup>88</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 5, 1.

<sup>89</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 5, 4.

<sup>90</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 2, 1.



describing Herodias as the wife of Herod Philip; whereas we have seen that he was not her husband, but her son-in-law.<sup>91</sup> The parallel passage in Luke, according to the best manuscripts, avoids this blunder, and quite correctly speaks of her as Antipas' brother's wife. We very frequently have occasion to notice Luke's care and accuracy;<sup>92</sup> and it is not without significance that, while indeed he assigns the Baptist's reproof, administered to Herod for his adultery with Herodias, as the reason of his incarceration, Luke entirely omits all reference to the incidents of the banquet, and the dancing of Herodias' daughter.<sup>93</sup> Mark and Matthew make a long interval of time to elapse between John's apprehension and his death; while Josephus makes the death follow immediately

<sup>91</sup> It involves an unwarrantable stretching of historical probabilities to suppose, as some have done, that the un-named Herod was also a Philip.

<sup>92</sup> We may instance here Lk. iii. 1, in which τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας is assigned to Philip's tetrarchy; which appears to conflict with Josephus, who gives him Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, Paneas, Batanea, Auranitis; *Ant.* xvii. 8, 1; 11, 4; xviii. 4, 6; *B.J.* ii. 6, 3. But see Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. ii. App. i. G. A. Smith, "*Historical Geography of the Holy Land*," pp. 544-547, 554.

<sup>93</sup> A comparison of Mk. and Mt. shows us that they depend upon a common source; perhaps some Baptist cycle of tradition. Mk. includes his authority whole, for its dramatic interest. Mt. abbreviates it, and indeed maims it, because of its relative unimportance for his narrative. Lk. confines himself to a chronicle of the historical facts, and either knows nothing of the banquet or brushes it aside.

upon his imprisonment at Machærus. But upon a question of this kind, the evangelists may easily have been in the right. Again, the evidence of Josephus to the effect that John's political activity was the cause of his death, does not conflict with, or exclude, the plausibility of the synoptic tradition, which gives as the immediate reason for his execution, his rebuke of Herod, and the wrath of Herodias. Josephus' statement that John was imprisoned at Machærus,<sup>94</sup> is supplemented by the assertion of the synoptists that Herod's birthday banquet also took place there.<sup>95</sup> It is legitimate to suppose that John, learning of the presence of Herod and his court at Machærus for this festal occasion, himself journeyed to that grim fortress, to beard the lion in his den, trusting, it may be, to the tide of popular feeling, which was running high in his favour, for protection. This conjecture would give colour to the synoptists' account of Herod's distaste for a course, which might win him the odium of the people; and it would also explain how it was that Herod should have arrested a man who was out of his jurisdiction. It has been suggested that the high-handed action of Pilate in slaying certain Galilæans who had come to Jerusalem to sacrifice, was the reason for the enmity which

<sup>94</sup> See appended note

<sup>95</sup> Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. ii. p. 26, note 27, shows that γενέσια cannot mean "anniversary of accession to the throne;" thus the occasion cannot be used for purposes of dating the Baptist's death.

existed between himself and Herod;<sup>96</sup> but it is not likely that Herod would venture to retaliate by trespassing on Roman preserves. It may be that the *prōcurator* was already on the point of suppressing John, when Herod, willing to seek his good opinion, was able to forestall him; simply because the Baptist delivered himself into his hands. Leaving Ænon, where he was a menace to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, he made his way to Machærus, with a forlorn hope that he might influence even Herod in the anticipation of the Messianic Kingdom; and there he met his death. But the storm of public indignation which Herod evoked, by thus undertaking the work of a Roman official, made him quickly repent his action; and, at a later date, we find him, in his unwillingness to incur the blame of putting another prophet to death, sending Jesus back to Pilate for judgment.<sup>97</sup>

4. The main difficulty to be faced, in the attempt to reconcile the narrative of the synoptists with Josephus, centres around the person

<sup>96</sup> Lk. xiii. 1-5. cf. Plummer, "*St. Luke*," pp. 337, 338.

<sup>97</sup> See *Ox. Studies*, p. 230. Mk. vi. 17 says of John's apprehension, ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησεν τὸν Ἰωάννην, which may mean no more than that he sent out into the court of the citadel. Mt. xiv. 3, omits the ἀποστείλας. Thus the Synoptic account does not conflict with the above view of the circumstances. Josephus does not tell us where the Baptist was seized. That Pilate did not himself have John arrested may have been due to the fact that his official residence was at Cæsarea, not at Jerusalem, which he only visited as occasion arose.

of Herodias' daughter. Neither Mark nor Matthew name the girl, but both agree in calling her a "maiden." Now Josephus tells us of only one daughter to Herodias by her former marriage, namely Salome.<sup>98</sup> If the dancer, then, was Salome, she could not yet have been married to Philip; otherwise she would not be termed a "maiden." But, as a matter of fact, we are led by Josephus to suppose that Salome had been married long before the probable date of the Baptist's execution. It is true that a very well attested reading of *Mark vi. 22*, adopted by Westcott and Hort, has "his daughter Herodias," for "the daughter of Herodias herself"; implying that the girl's name was Herodias, and not Salome; and that she was the daughter of Antipas and Herodias. But this does not help us; for, not only does Josephus remain silent about any issue of this marriage, but we are brought up by the chronological reminder that, had there been a daughter, she could not have been above two years old at the occasion of the banquet.<sup>99</sup> It is perhaps wise to conclude that the whole incident of the dancing is, according to our present evidence, without historical foundation; and, following the example of Luke, we may omit it.

5. But John's rebuke of Herod has a verisimilitude we cannot deny. The rugged prophet may well have focussed upon himself the disaffected elements in Jewish society, if his

<sup>98</sup> See appended note

<sup>99</sup> See appended note

preaching of the Kingdom and Messiah was held to include the downfall of Roman administration ; and in this way he may have become a greater source of political unrest and peril, than he would himself have been able to fathom. But it would have needed something more than this to stir so cautious an administrator as Antipas, to take the bold course of apprehending and executing one who stood so high in the popular imagination ; even though his political integrity might have been somewhat compromised by letting him go free. The insult, as he would have regarded it, to Herodias, of whom he was both fond and jealous, provides us with just the motive required to make the story intelligible. That would have been sufficient to goad him to such an action, especially if the woman herself adopted a stimulating rôle. But we may ask why it was that John should have gone somewhat out of his way to stigmatise an offence which the public conscience condoned,<sup>100</sup> when he could not have hoped to effect any beneficial result, and when he was thereby only putting a halter around his neck ? It is possible that we may find an answer in the question addressed to Jesus, as Matthew has it "from prison," "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another ?" It is evident that John is dubious as to the Messiahship of

<sup>100</sup> The language of Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 5, 4, upon her offence is strong ; but we have no reason to suppose that the view of an eminent Pharisee would have reflected popular opinion.

Jesus on that occasion; and it is probable that this scepticism had long been taking shape in his mind. It would have been based upon the total absence in Jesus' work of those marks of the Messiahship which John, who was ignorant of what Jesus' claim really amounted to, expected to see. In particular he failed to observe any steps towards the claiming of the Davidic crown and Kingdom, as against the usurpation of the Herodian line. What, in the circumstances, could be more natural, than that, as his disappointment increased, he should himself determine upon a bold stroke, calculated to precipitate a crisis? If he were to beard the official representative of the Hasmonæan power, with its reminiscences of lost opportunities, and its vaunt of irreligious rule; he might create a situation which would give an opening to Jesus to prosecute His rightful claims to sovereignty. But in this, too, he was doomed to disappointment. He was seized, and thrown into a dungeon; and Jesus remained quiet. Then there followed his execution and burial; and when Jesus was told of this tragedy, He removed Himself from the neighbourhood of Herod's jurisdiction, in order to escape the vindictive measures which Antipas might mete out to all who should be supposed to sympathise with the aims of the Baptist.

6. Before we leave this narrative, we may notice Herod's personal relations with the Baptist, as the synoptists portray them for us.

Mark tells us that the persecution of John was undertaken at the instigation of Herodias. It must not be supposed that the Baptist was splintering a lance against the legal provision for a levirate marriage; for Herodias' first husband was still alive, and she had issue by him. The case was, rather, a particularly grave form of adultery, which in the Law was regarded as a species of incest.<sup>101</sup> We cannot wonder, therefore, when we remember the undoubted fact of Herodias' love for Antipas,<sup>102</sup> that she should have resented keenly the stigma cast upon her from, as she would probably have said, the very narrow and conventional standpoint which John adopted. Therefore it was that "Herodias set herself against him, and desired to kill him; and she could not." At first she only partially achieved her purpose; for while she persuaded her husband to imprison John, she could not prevail upon him to slay him. It is more than possible that, defeated in argument, she resorted to other expedients, poison or the dagger; for Mark tells us that Herod "kept him safe."<sup>103</sup> But in any case, her attempts against his life were unsuccessful; and a trick to win Herod's

<sup>101</sup> cf. Deut. xxv. 5; and Lev. xviii. 16. The "in-breeding" of the Herodian house was almost as notorious as that of the Ptolemies; a fact which may have contributed to the general Jewish feeling that they were foreigners.

<sup>102</sup> She follows her husband to captivity, out of love for him. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 7, 2.

<sup>103</sup> See appended note

consent to his execution became necessary. It is interesting to observe that her persuasions were nullified, by encountering in Herod a, possibly unsuspected, dead wall of fear; superstitious fear, Mark has it, political fear, Matthew. Mark's words run, "Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous man and a holy, and kept him safe. And when he heard him, he was much perplexed;<sup>104</sup> and he heard him gladly." Over against this, we read in Matthew, "And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet." In the one narrative, that is, we are told that Antipas was anxious to take John's life, and only refrained when he considered the danger of unduly exciting the animosity of the prophet's adherents; in the other, that the Baptist in captivity came to exercise a powerful influence upon his mind, impressing upon it a sense of other-worldliness and the spirit of self-sacrifice for high ideals, and stirring in it an uneasy consciousness of wrong-doing and a dread of ultimate penalties. The latter picture recalls the similar relationship of Paul with Felix.<sup>105</sup> This distinction is preserved throughout the two narratives; so that, when Herod had been tricked into giving his consent to John's execution, Mark tells us that he was "exceeding sorry," as though oppressed by a feeling of untold peril;

<sup>104</sup> Πολλά ἠπόρει. Another, but less safe, reading has πολλά ἐποiei.

<sup>105</sup> Ac. xxiv. 25.



whereas Matthew has the milder expression, that he "was grieved," which hints at no more than the political embroilments he might now be obliged to face.<sup>106</sup> Josephus, of course, gives no support to the superstitious side of Herod's fears; but we may easily find room for both emotions in the crafty but ignoble character of Antipas.<sup>107</sup> It was very probably this fear, and a tardy remorse for his action, which prompted him to allow John's disciples to remove and inter the corpse of their master; though, indeed, as the body would certainly have lain in one of the rock-cut tombs in the close vicinity of the fortress, there was little possibility that the enthusiasm of his adherents would establish a cult of the dead prophet.

7. It remains to enquire, at what period in the ministry of Jesus did the execution of the Baptist fall? Any attempt to answer this question must be purely conjectural; and, in the production of an intelligible sequence of events, so great a dislocation of the order of the

<sup>106</sup> Mt. xiv. 9, has *λυπηθεὶς*; Mk. vi. 26, *περίλυπος γενόμενος*. *Περίλυπος* is used of excessive trouble, under overwhelming calamities, or from a sense of impending doom. cf. Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.* iv. 3, 18. *Καὶ οὐτ' εὐτυχῶν περιχαρὴς ἔσται, οὐτ' ἀτυχῶν περίλυπος*. Ps. xli. 6 (LXX) "ἵνα τί περίλυπος εἶ, ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ ἵνα τί συνταράσσεις με; 1 Esdras viii. 69 (73) *Καὶ ἐκαθήμην περίλυπος ἕως τῆς δειλινῆς θυσίας*. It is also used of the "rich young man" in Lk. xviii. 23; and of Jesus, in His agony in Gethsemane, Mt. xxvi. 38.

<sup>107</sup> cf. G. A. Smith, "*Book of the Twelve Prophets*," vol. ii. p. 182.

synoptists appears necessary, that the endeavour may well be termed subjective. But we may take it, as one result of our previous investigation, that the testimony rendered to the Baptist by Jesus was spoken after his death. The remarks made during John's life-time, as for instance that about his exclusion from the Kingdom, and his unfitness for the bride-chamber, read more like strictures upon his conduct. But this testimony is, in general, impossible to place with any accuracy; and we must be content to take that at the Transfiguration, spoken under the stress of great emotion, and therefore not long subsequent to John's death, as our *terminus ad quem*. Now in *Mark i. 14, 15*, we read "after that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel." With this we must compare *Matthew, iv. 12, 17*, "When he heard that John was delivered up, he withdrew into Galilee. . . . From that time began Jesus to preach, and to say, Repent ye; for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." There can be no doubt that, in their strict meaning, these passages imply, first that John's imprisonment followed shortly after his baptising of Jesus, and second, that the imprisonment marked the moment of the commencement of Jesus' ministry. But we may, nevertheless, observe that, at least in Mark's case, the notation of time is indefinite. For

him, the beginning of Jesus' ministry synchronises with the end of John's; and perhaps he had no reliable information of any period of work preceding that event. But his language does not exclude a previous ministry in both Galilee and Judæa. The incident of the question about fasting clearly suggests that John was still at liberty, while Jesus was engaged upon His life's work. Rather, the words of Jesus' message, which are at once an echo and an amplification of John's, suggest that the imprisonment of John was the occasion of a fresh departure in the preaching of Jesus. Up to now, that preaching had lacked the qualities John had expected to see in it; but at this moment Jesus strikes a fresh note, the coming of the Kingdom, and takes up the Baptist's message where he left it. It is possible that Jesus withdrew from Judæa to escape collision with the authorities, which John had provoked. But when He found that Herod, satisfied with the capture of John, proceeded to take no further steps against his friends and adherents, Jesus would have felt Himself safe, for a while, in Galilee, though that was Antipas' territory. It is improbable that John's incarceration was of long duration. The whole tragedy may have matured rapidly, and occupied no further time than Herod's stay at Machærus for the birthday festivities; possibly only a few weeks. Thus, shortly after Jesus' work in Galilee had commenced, there would have come the intelligence

of John's execution. It may have been upon the receipt of this news that Jesus escaped northwards to the region of Tyre and Sidon. On His return from this temporary retreat, He chose and sent out the Twelve; and so first attracted to Himself the attention of Antipas. The failure of that mission to bring the Kingdom, led on to the ecstasy of the Transfiguration, in which He now realised fully the necessity of His death. Thereafter He grew bolder in His actions; and Herod was tempted to wish that he might slay Him, as he had slain the Baptist, though he was too cautious to carry his design into execution. It is thus plausible to suppose that John's death fell about midway in the ministry of Jesus; and, if we may for the moment anticipate the results of the discussion of the Lukan chronology, we may say that it took place in the year A.D. 29.

## VII

### THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE BAPTISM

(Lk. iii. 1; 2<sup>a</sup>; Mk. i. 6; Lk. iii. 10-14; i. 5-25, 36, 39-45, 56-66, 80.)

1. So far, we have worked forwards, from the first and only meeting of John Baptist with Jesus, on to, and beyond, the death of the former. We must now reverse the process, and work backwards from the Baptism, to what our sources enable us to glean of the life of the Baptist antecedent to that event. It will be well to begin with the chronological note, by which Luke attempts to fix the date of Jesus' Baptism, and the opening of His ministry. For it is important to notice that in Luke's narrative the Baptist fills the entirely subordinate office of "the prophet of the Most High," whose mission it is to "go before the face of the Lord to make ready his ways." That is, the Baptist has no interest for the historian of the life of Jesus, except in so far as his appearance heralds "the dayspring from on high." There can be

no doubt that Luke intends us to understand that the mission of the Baptist was of very short duration; that it did not, in fact, precede that of Jesus by more than a few weeks or months. And from Luke's point of view, as Jesus' biographer, this may be strictly accurate; that is to say, the particular phase of John's ministry which brought him into close connection with Jesus, the period during which he delivered that "word of God" which found its fulfilment in the person of Jesus, would necessarily have very closely anticipated His advent. But that does not exclude a previous ministry on the part of the Baptist, of a more independent character, which it would not be within Luke's province to treat of, and which he may have had good reason to omit. In any case, it is this period of John's work which Luke places at the end of the year 28 A.D.<sup>108</sup>

2. Luke tells us that John was the son of Zacharias; a piece of information obviously taken over from the special source of his first two chapters. Whatever may be the historical value of those chapters, the tradition which ascribes to him a priestly origin may be as well grounded as that which traced Jesus' lineage, apparently during His life-time, to the house of David.<sup>109</sup> According to Luke, John was in the desert when the call of God reached him; and, in obedience to that call, he immediately came

<sup>108</sup> See appended note

<sup>109</sup> cf. Dalman, "*Words of Jesus*," pp. 319-324.

down into the Jordan valley, to discharge there his particular mission. Mark and Matthew both carry us a step further back, when they speak of a ministry of preaching in the wilderness of Judæa,<sup>110</sup> which seems to have preceded the baptising with a special purpose in the Jordan valley. John's call appears to have had reference to the advent of the mightier One, whose office would be to convey a spiritual regeneration, by baptism, to the elect, and thus save them in the Day of Wrath. His own baptising would have served the twofold purpose of revealing the greater Prophet, and preparing His material, by marking off those whose election had been proved by their repentance. But, previously to this new departure, John had preached the coming of the Day of the Lord and the necessity of repentance in the Judæan desert. It is probable that the greater part of his discourse, as reported by Matthew and Luke, belongs to this earlier period.<sup>111</sup> And it is to this phase in the Baptist's life that Jesus refers in the question "What went ye out into the wilderness to behold?" In other words, John was already a prophet, with a distinct message of his own, and had already achieved a large measure of popularity, when he gained the

<sup>110</sup> For a description of the Judæan desert, see G. A. Smith, "*Hist. Geog.*" pp. 312-317.

<sup>111</sup> The invective, "offspring of vipers," and "these stones," would have been suggested by the conditions of the desert.

spiritual impetus, which drove him from his desert haunts, and launched him upon his new enterprise. At first he wandered through "all the region round about Jordan," persuading, urging, exhorting men to come to his baptism; and then he led them to Beth Nimrah, where in the end he met with Jesus. For how long a time the previous prophetic career had lasted it is impossible to say; though we shall see, later on, that there is reason to suppose it may have extended over several years.<sup>112</sup> But it seems that his ascetic manner of life did not commence with his mission, if we may accept the tradition which says that he had adopted such a rule from his early childhood. Of this asceticism Mark and Matthew give us certain particulars. John clothed himself, it seems, with a garment of camel's hair, which he girded round his loins with a leather belt. This recalls the description of the prophet Elijah, whom the Baptist may well have taken as his exemplar, without for a moment supposing that he was himself the Elijah of prophecy. His food consisted of locusts and wild honey.<sup>113</sup> The counsels which Luke puts into the Baptist's mouth, in answer to the questionings of various classes of his hearers, can hardly be otherwise than the product of the narrator's art. But they may, nevertheless, reflect the Baptist's moral attitude towards the

<sup>112</sup> The ground for this statement is the "*Zadokite Document*," which will presently receive attention.

<sup>113</sup> See appended note



society of his day; and they may be regarded as contributing something towards a picture of the social conditions of the third decade of the first century in Judæa.

3. From the "day of his showing to Israel," we pass back to the narrative of the nativity and infancy, recorded in the first two chapters of Luke. And here it is difficult to feel that we are on clear historical ground. In the first place, our suspicions are aroused by what we may call a sort of artificial parallelism, in the circumstances attaching to the births of Jesus and of John, respectively. In each case an angel brings the announcement to the parent of the coming nativity. The names by which the children are to be known are miraculously conveyed, and have a mysterious significance.<sup>114</sup> The actual birth of both is marvellous; in the one case of a virgin, and in the other of a woman past the age of child-bearing. Mary and Zacharias both burst into song over the wonderful events which are being brought to pass. The highest expectations are formed of the future careers of both children. While of Jesus we read that "the child grew, and waxed strong, becoming full of wisdom;" of John it is said that "the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit." And, just as John was executed about six months before the crucifixion of Jesus, and as he is made

<sup>114</sup> Ἰωάννης = יְהוֹנָתָן, a shortened form of יְהוֹרֶחֱנָן = Yahwè is gracious. Ἰησοῦς = יְהוֹשֻׁעַ = Yahwè is deliverance.

to begin his ministry perhaps six months before the Baptism; so his birth is calculated to have antedated that of Jesus by just six months. Then, too, the words of prophecy very clearly reflect the subsequent historical facts. John, it is said, is to be filled with the Holy Ghost, is to be endowed, that is, with the prophetic temperament; and he is to live an ascetic life, somewhat similar to the Nazarite of old. His preaching will have the effect of turning many to God; and his mission is to act as the forerunner of the Messiah. His very character is fore-cast; and his office as the Elijah of prophecy is indicated. If this had been a fact, we may well ask how it was that his office remained a secret to himself and to others, until it was unlocked by Jesus when the Baptist's mission had been sealed in death? Is it not more probable that the subsequent knowledge of the Baptist's career is thrown back, by the natural modifications of an oral tradition, to a period before his birth? In short, when we see that the main current of synoptic tradition makes Jesus and John unknown to each other, previously to the Baptism; we are fain to conclude that the whole story of John's infancy is no more than a beautiful idyll, constructed in the desire, partly homiletic and partly polemic, to bring together the Messiah and His forerunner from the earliest possible period. This tendency goes even to the extreme length of making John leap in his mother's womb, when he comes into the presence

of his unborn Master; a Master whom he failed to recognise as Messiah in his ministerial life! This is the hallowing of the imaginative faculty, perhaps; but it is not history.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>115</sup> The early chapters of Lk. abound in Hebraisms (not Aramaisms). It is characteristic of Hellenic writers to adopt a Biblical style, with its Hebraisms culled from the Greek O.T., in order to produce the necessary artistic effect upon their readers. These Hebraisms, therefore, are a sign of artistic treatment of tradition; and "the fewer the Hebraisms, the greater the originality of the tradition." cf. Dalman, "*Words of Jesus*," pp. 42, 183, 38-42. "*Oxford Studies*," pp. 292, 294, note 2. Whether the artistic treatment is Lk.'s own, and if the tradition in other respects is to be traced to Mary, can only be matters of speculation. But to rend the Johannine Nativity story from the rest does not of necessity discredit the Virgin-birth of Jesus. The probability is that the general setting is largely imaginative, and the angelic visitants may clearly be interpreted in a subjective sense. But the central fact, which is to some extent corroborated by the independent account in Matthew, may remain unshaken. For a fair discussion of the authenticity of these narratives, which lies beyond our scope, see Allen, "*St. Matthew*," pp. 18-22.

## VIII

### THE EVIDENCE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

(Jn. i. 6-8, 15, 19-37, 40.)

1. We pass again to difficult ground, when we come to examine what the fourth evangelist has to tell us of the Baptist. But a clear distinction is to be observed between this and the early chapters of Luke, in which we see a pious fancy weaving itself into unsubstantial dreams, and already supplying a basis for the legendary stories of the childhood of Jesus, told with such wealth of detail in the Apocryphal Gospels. The fourth gospel was certainly written after a considerable lapse of time, not earlier than near the close of the first century; and it is written in a spirit of calm reflection, which is able to throw events into their true perspective. This mode of writing, and the circumstances and date of its authorship, does not guarantee the historical accuracy of the details of the narrative; still less can it command our assent to the motive forces which are traced as determining its progression.

It is history written with a purpose; and the material is subjected to a kind of idealistic treatment. But in a wider sense than the mere chronicling of events, as a presentation of the inner relations of those events, as a treatment of them from the point of view of the significance they were subsequently seen to possess, as a product of philosophic and religious perception, the fourth gospel is historical beyond the more commonplace ambitions of the synoptists. We shall, in consequence, look to find there rather the larger issues, the developed Christian estimate of the character and work of the Baptist, than specific incidents in his career which we could regard as substantially attested.

2. The fourth gospel is, in some measure at least, an *apologia*; while it is philosophical in its outlook, it is also somewhat controversial in its tone. The prologue develops a *Logos*-doctrine of the Person of the Christ, which is probably enunciated for the express purpose of combating the Gnostic opinion that Jesus was the human embodiment of an *Æon*.<sup>116</sup> This being so, we should be prepared to find this

<sup>116</sup> The Johannine *Λόγος* seems to have owed something both to the Philonian *Λόγος* and the Rabbinical *מִימְרָא*; but not without a distinctive remodelling of the conception by the author. In other words, he probably took hold of the term from his Gnostic opponents, and gave it a new content. cf. Westcott, "*St. John*," pp. xv.-xviii.; and Fairweather, in Hastings' "*Dict. Bib.*" extra vol. pp. 281-285. In the Valentinian system, Jesus is the joint production of thirty *æons*, including *Λόγος*. cf. Hippolytus, "*Refut. Haer.*," vi. 27.

apologetic treatment extended to other persons concerned in the history. Thus, when we read in the same prologue, of John Baptist, that "he was not the light, but (came) that he might bear witness of the light. (There) was the true light, etc.," we may take it that the author is expressly contradicting an opinion that John, and not Jesus, had been the expected Messiah. This is an interesting point, with which we shall deal in some detail. But we must first remark, that the tendency we have observed, in the synoptic account, to treat the Baptist only in his relation to Jesus, in the fourth gospel results in a historical view, in accordance with which John is practically submerged in, or absorbed by, the Person of Jesus; so that we can scarcely feel that he has any independent individuality. In point of fact, his place in history is shown to be the utterly subordinate one of witnessing to the Messiah.<sup>117</sup> Yet even so, we shall notice some undesigned contradictions, which will enable us, to some extent, to separate the figure of the Baptist from the setting in which the evangelist places him.

3. The synoptic record presents the Baptist as recognising in Jesus the Messiah, the One mightier than he, who should come after him; but it nowhere suggests, as does the fourth gospel, a public identification of Him. And when, in connection with this proclamation, we find a statement as to the pre-existence of Jesus

<sup>117</sup> See appended note

put into the Baptist's mouth; we may legitimately suspect, throughout this account, a tendency to dwell upon theological values, by virtue of an idealistic treatment of persons, and at the expense of historical facts.<sup>118</sup> The complete consciousness, on the part of John, of his own peculiar mission in relation to Jesus, is more or less implicitly denied by the synoptists; but in the fourth gospel we have an incident introduced in favour of that consciousness, which would be fresh material for the study of the Baptist's life, but that we are necessarily precluded from regarding it as historical. A deputation of priests and Levites, we are told, waited upon John with the question, "Who art thou?" He is made, in the first place, to deny that he is the Messiah. The synoptic tradition only in one place suggests that this conjectural identification was hazarded during the life-time of either the Baptist or Jesus. In *Luke iii. 15*, we read, "as the people were in expectation, and all men reasoned in their hearts concerning John, whether haply he were the Christ." But this has no show of historical probability; for not only did John exhibit none of the signs of the Messiahship, but the suggestion seriously con-

<sup>118</sup> The curious supersession of *πρότερός* by *πρώτος* in Jn. i. 15, on which see Moulton, "*Prolegomena*," p. 79, does not imply (so Westcott, *op. cit.* p. 13) "not only relative, but absolute priority"; but pre-existence is plainly to be derived. It is a priority not in time, but in status or degree; He who is to be greater, has in some previous condition been greater, than John.

flicts with the main current of the synoptic evidence. In the fourth Gospel we may perhaps trace the original of this report; for we are told that the deputation was sent by the Pharisees. This reminds us of the counsel given by Gamaliel in after years to the *Synedrion*, in the course of which he mentions a certain Theudas, who may very possibly have claimed to be the Messiah. The Pharisees were inclined to oppose a deadly hostility to Messianic claims which seemed to savour of a temporal character; and an insinuation that a religious teacher had advanced such claims would be sufficient, in their eyes, to expose him as an impostor. If we add this to the undoubted contentions of the Baptist's later adherents, we have sufficient grounds both for the supposition that John himself made this claim, and for the introduction into the narratives of the evangelists of a direct denial by the Baptist of such an imputation, as well as the anticipations of the rise of false Christs put into Jesus' mouth in the apocalyptic discourses.<sup>119</sup> But in any case, there can be little doubt that the rumour belongs to a later period than the Baptist's life-time.

4. Next, John is made to deny that he is the Elijah. This is in accord with the silence of the synoptists upon any such claim; but, frankly, we should have expected the fourth evangelist, writing from the point of view which credits John

<sup>119</sup> For the account of Theudas, cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 5. 1; Acts, v. 36. cf. Mt. xxiv. 5, 23, 24.



with a full realisation of his own position in the historical drama, to have abided by the express statement of Jesus, that John was the Elijah. It is, therefore, somewhat perplexing to meet with this denial in his narrative; unless we may assume that his contemporaries were only interested in the question of the Messiahship, and not at all in that of the office of the Elijah; and that he was therefore free to reproduce the exact historical situation. Again, John, having denied that he is "the prophet," by whom we may understand the prophet of *Deut. xviii. 15*, or possibly Jeremiah, goes on to claim for himself the title which the synoptists claim for him; "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness," a nameless, impersonal, herald of Him who is to come. The supposition that this was, in fact, a title chosen by John is entirely probable. Arising out of this answer, his questioners proceed to ask the Baptist, "Why then dost thou baptise, if thou art neither the Messiah, nor Elijah, nor the Prophet?" The meaning, and pertinence, of the question is obvious.<sup>120</sup> It would be entirely suitable that the founder of the Kingdom, or His forerunner, should use baptism

<sup>120</sup> It is difficult to see how the question can be made to imply, "Why do you administer baptism to Jews? It is a rite fitting for proselytes; but Israelites are already fitted by the fact of birth for the Messianic Kingdom." cf. Hastings' *D.B.* vol. i. p. 240. There is no hint in the 4th Gospel that the rite was in any sense purificatory; and therefore it would not have given a handle for objection to the legalists.

as a symbol of initiation ; just as it was used by the Jews themselves for the reception of proselytes. Moreover, the scribes held that baptism was predicted as the rite peculiar to the Messiah when He should come.<sup>121</sup> But for a preacher who had no such ends in view, and who repudiated the impressions of high dignity he is said to have conveyed, baptism would be superfluous. John replies by announcing the advent of the Messiah, and by defending his own baptism as merely a type of the Messiah's, which was to follow. "I baptise with water," he says ; omitting to state the antithesis, which would have been the nature of the Messiah's baptism. We can hardly doubt the polemical purport of this passage, which seems obviously framed to point out, to the Baptists of the author's own day, the meaninglessness of the rite they practised.

5. The words in which John bears witness to Jesus, are in reality a proclamation of His Messiahship, and would have been understood in that sense by the evangelist's readers. "Behold the Lamb of God, which beareth the sin of the world," is a reminiscence of two clauses in the great Servant-passage of Isaiah (*liii.* 7,

<sup>121</sup> cf. *Zech.* *xiii.* 1. "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." *Ez.* *xxxvi.* 25. "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." *Is.* *lii.* 15. "So shall he sprinkle many nations." See, however, Kennett, "*The Servant of the Lord*," p. 84 ; Peake, "*The Problem of Suffering in the O.T.*" p. 52, note 23. cf. *Heb.* *x.* 22.

12), "as a lamb that is led to the slaughter," and "he bare the sin of many."<sup>122</sup> This public proclamation is represented as having been made, on two occasions, after John had baptised Jesus; and the words "in the midst of you standeth one whom ye know not," amount to the same declaration put in a more ambiguous form. The fourth evangelist twice puts into the Baptist's mouth an emphatic denial of any knowledge of Jesus, previous to the baptism; "I knew him not." This does not necessarily imply an ignorance, or repudiation, of the Lukan nativity narrative; but it does seem to mean that the Baptist had no personal acquaintance with Jesus, and no suspicion of His high calling. He was able to recognise Him at the moment of the baptism, as the Coming One whose advent he had announced, by a kind of spiritual intuition which he clothes in the symbolic language of the synoptists, "I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven." This is, so far, in full agreement with the narrative of the other gospels. But the fourth evangelist adds that John's mission was no more than the selection of the Messiah by the rite of baptism; "that he should be made manifest to Israel, for this cause

<sup>122</sup> This identification of Jesus with the Suffering Servant, and of the latter figure with the Messiah, was accomplished by Jesus Himself at, or before, the Transfiguration, and was probably communicated to the disciples, as a secret, in connection with the predictions of His death. Later, it naturally became the common property of Christian devotional thought.

came I baptising with water ;" a verse which contains a further answer to the former question of the deputation of priests and Levites, "Why then baptisest thou?" In other words, John was sent with a general commission to baptise, being told beforehand that the baptism of the many would culminate in the baptism of the One, who would by this means receive the necessary power for His mission, and so be "made manifest to Israel." The account reminds us of the selection of David by Samuel. This is a departure from the synoptic record, and may be defended as a philosophical review of the facts. But in one point it is in conflict with that record ; for it makes no mention of any other purpose in John's baptising than this ; it contains, that is to say, no reference to "repentance unto remission of sins." This may be accounted for, in part, by the possibility that, in the author's view, what had a mere ephemeral significance might well be omitted ; and, in part, by the fact that his aim is to show the latter-day Baptists that John's baptism had indeed possessed, but had served, its purpose. For John, according to our author, was only to continue baptising until the Messiah had been revealed, in and through his baptism. Logically, we should have expected the baptising to cease when, by its means, the Messiah had been found and recognised. But it is, at first, perplexing to find that our logical anticipations are disappointed. To this we shall return presently. It was with a view, then, to

the selection of the Messiah that John had been instructed before by God that he was to watch for the vision of the Spirit; and the instruction included the statement that the Messiah would baptise with the Holy Ghost; in which statement we have the conclusion of the incomplete "I baptise with water," which went before. The point the evangelist appears to be making here is, that John's baptism would become swallowed up in that of the Messiah, which would contain the power to which the former pointed; and, further, that John's mission would henceforward wear a different complexion, insomuch as, instead of baptising, he would now bear witness only to the present Messiah, who alone could impart the grace men needed. Of course, when John is made to declare that Jesus is "the Son of God," we must read this as the evangelist's mature reflection upon the ultimate significance of the Baptist's mission.

(Jn. iii. 22-24: iv. 1-3.)

6. We now return to the difficulty to which we have already alluded. In *John*, i. 35-37, 40, the Baptist is represented as passing on his disciples to Jesus; a proceeding which is quite consistent with the theory of John's mission which the fourth gospel elucidates, though it is in contradiction to the reports of the synoptists. But in these two short passages we have now to consider, John is reported to be still baptising, and still gathering disciples around him; and

this appears to be incompatible with the former representation of the witness he bore to Jesus subsequent to the baptism. We can only suppose that the evangelist felt himself constrained to admit facts which were well known, and which were susceptible of proof by the existence of a Baptist school in his own day; namely, that John did continue to baptise, and make disciples of his own, after he had acknowledged in Jesus the Messiah. But that would not, in itself, have invalidated the theory that such a propaganda on John's part was inconsistent with the very clear conception he possessed of his own mission. Rather, we may trace here a reminiscence of the synoptic account of John's subsequent defection; and whatever inconsistency there is, would have to be laid, not to the evangelist's, but to the Baptist's charge. Now the evangelist tells us that Jesus was baptising near to the scene of John's later activities; but, a little further on, he corrects this mistake, and makes it clear that, not Jesus but His disciples actually did the baptising. Is it possible to understand this careful correction, and to discover a reason why, in the opinion of our author, Jesus did not Himself baptise, but gave charge to His disciples to do so? The synoptic records are silent on the subject of Jesus Himself baptising; and so far the fourth gospel is in agreement with them. But they also are silent about Jesus' disciples engaging in the work of baptism, and place their commission to do so

after the Resurrection. This does not preclude the possibility that they may spasmodically have carried on the Baptist's work, in his spirit and with his intention;<sup>123</sup> but that would hardly satisfy the requirements of the present case, where they are said to be working under the auspices and direction of Jesus. The probability is, rather, that the fourth evangelist is mistaken; and that this would have formed one of the grievances of the Baptist, who looked for the immediate inauguration of the Spirit-baptism by the Messiah, in fulfilment of the words of *Joel*, ii. 28. But, to return to the elucidation of our difficulty, it may be suggested, in the first place, that as Jesus had adopted the rôle of a Jewish Rabbi, it would by common custom have fallen to the lot of His disciples to do the services which would have been somewhat beneath His own official dignity.<sup>124</sup> But the careful mention of this fact by the evangelist, in writing to a world which was mainly Greek and

<sup>123</sup> cf. Westcott, "*St. John*," pp. 58, 62. Justin Martyr, *D.T.* li. while not ignorant of the fact that John continued his mission after the coming of Jesus, makes it clear that his work ought properly to have ceased: *Εἰ δὲ Ἰωάννης μὲν προελήλυθε βροτῶν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μετανοεῖν, καὶ Χριστὸς ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ποταμοῦ, ἐπελθὼν ἔπαυσέ τε αὐτὸν τοῦ προφητεύειν καὶ βαπτίζειν, καὶ εὐηγγελίζετο καὶ αὐτὸς λέγων ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.*

<sup>124</sup> For *ἦ* and *ἦ* as a form of address to Jesus, of Schürer, *H.J.P.* II. i. pp. 315-317; Dalman, "*Words*," pp. 331-336; and for the reverence of disciples see Schürer.

would not have been cognisant of this custom, suggests that there may have been a theological reason present to his mind. It is easy to say that the baptism by Jesus' disciples could not have been other than symbolical before His Resurrection and Ascension, and that Jesus' work at this point exactly meets that of the Baptist. But when we remember the Baptist's prediction of the Spirit-baptism, the silence of the synoptists as to the baptising by the disciples, and the polemical tendencies of the fourth gospel, we desire some further reason for the introduction of what would otherwise be a superfluous piece of information. And we may perhaps find it in the possibility that our author is anxious to show that, in the divine economy, the Christ works through His appointed disciples, or ministers; and, thus, that if the separatists of his own day should claim more for their rite than the Baptist claimed for his, they can have no valid gift of the Spirit to dispense. But if the fourth evangelist is mistaken in this point, at least he provides us, in these passages, with an intelligible sequence of events, which accords with the conclusions we have reached on independent grounds. John, it appears, was at first baptising at Bethany, which we identify with Beth Nimrah, on the east of Jordan. There Jesus was Himself baptised. At some time subsequent to His withdrawal into the Judæan desert for the Temptation, a period of inactivity which would have given rise to John's



apprehensions, Jesus appeared in Judæa with a little band of disciples, and began preaching at a spot in the close vicinity of 'Ain Kārim, where the Baptist was now baptising and gathering to him great numbers of adherents. Shortly after this came John's dramatic visit to Machærus, his unexpected imprisonment, the dispersal of his followers, and Jesus' retirement to Galilee. The increasing popularity of Jesus, together with the waning of John's, and the suspicious hostility of the Pharisees consequent upon this reversal of fortune, can hardly be accepted as the motive of the northern journey, or an accurate reading of historical events.

(Mk. ix. 38-40: Lk. ix. 49, 50.)

7. We may here interpolate some remarks upon the interesting case, recorded by Mark and Luke, of the unnamed exorcist, who used Jesus' name, but did not profess himself His disciple. It would appear that we have here a man who, while not convinced that Jesus was the Coming One spoken of by John, yet revered Him as a great teacher, in whose name he found a strange power to work miracles. He is not opposed to Jesus, and yet he is not His disciple. His position seems to have been a tentative one, of awaiting upon events; his faith in Jesus is empirical, and still lacks conviction. And Jesus rebukes the hasty intolerance of John and his fellow-worker, and is content to regard the man as a potential disciple. The case is quite dis-

similar to that of the Jewish priest Sceva, whose acts would have been regarded, even in those days, as a dabbling in the black art, a transgression of the limits of legitimate practice.<sup>125</sup> It was, rather, similar to the healing of the lame man at the door "Beautiful" by Peter, and the exorcism of the dæmon from the pythoness at Philippi by Paul.<sup>126</sup> That is, the act was inspired by a religious motive, and not for the purposes of gain. Exorcism of this kind was of common occurrence amongst the Jews; nor were its successes any matter of wonderment.<sup>127</sup> But the attitude of the man in question is so like that of the Baptist himself, that we may feel tempted to see in him one of John's disciples.

(Jn. iii. 25-30.)

8. We may now return to the questioning which arose on the part of John's disciples with a Jew about purifying. The actual topic of conversation, if we are right in our estimate of John's

<sup>125</sup> Acts xix. 13-17. For the distinction between "white" and "black" magic, see, e.g. Budge, *"Egyptian Magic,"* p. 3. Underhill, *"Mysticism,"* chap. vii. Joyce, *"Inspiration of Prophecy,"* chap. ii. Marett, *"Threshold of Religion,"* pp. 81, 82, 97, 98.

<sup>126</sup> Ac. iii. 6: xvi. 18.

<sup>127</sup> Lk. xi. 19: Mt. vii. 22. Jesus' attitude on this occasion recalls that of Moses, in Num. xi. 28, 29, and Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 5. See the curious introduction of the name of Jesus into a Jewish-pagan magical text shown by Deismann, *"Light from the Ancient East,"* p. 252, ὁρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων, Ἰησοῦ. Also *op. cit.* p. 309, upon a charm, a parallel to Lk. xi. 20. Ἐξορκίζω . . . κατὰ τοῦ δακτύλου τοῦ θεοῦ.

baptism, would have been somewhat as follows. The Baptist's disciples would have contended that their master's rite was only preparatory to, and symbolic of, the Messiah's; that it was a token of sincerity on the side of those baptised, but that it had no other side, for it conveyed no gift. This is, as we have seen, the line of John's own explanation of it. The Jew, on the contrary, probably argued that a baptism of this kind was valueless; that what men wanted was a purificatory rite, similar to those provided by the Mosaic law, which would really cleanse from sin. Possibly our author wishes us to understand that the disciples did not yet grasp the fact which the Baptist was inculcating, that Jesus was the Messiah; that they were inclined to resent the baptism by Jesus' disciples as an infringement of their own rights; and that they were jealous of John's honour, when his baptism was depreciated in favour of that of Jesus. However that may be, John's disciples, being worsted in the argument, and somewhat perplexed, are represented as coming to their master to ask him about Jesus' baptism. "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan,<sup>128</sup> to whom thou hast borne witness, behold, the same baptiseth, and all men come to him." In other words, "You do not

<sup>128</sup> The fourth Gospel suggests that Jesus kept John company for some while after the Baptism, in the position perhaps of a disciple. cf. Westcott, "*St. John*," p. 58. The other Gospels do not hint at anything beyond a transitory meeting. Justin Martyr, *D.T.* xiv. speaking of Jewish ablutions, says that Christian bap-

profess that your baptism is more than a symbol. But the baptism of Jesus, to which you pointed in such a striking fashion ; is that a reality or not? Is that a purification from sin, and does it convey a gift of the Spirit? If so, is Jesus the Messiah?" John's answer is unmistakably in the affirmative. "A man can receive nothing, except it hath been given him from heaven ;" or, to put it slightly otherwise, "Jesus is the Messiah ; and, as such, He has received a gift from the treasure-house of heaven, which now He is able to dispense in His baptism." Now this interpretation seems to accord well with the polemical purpose of the Gospel ; the insistence upon the valuelessness of John's, and the profound importance of Jesus' baptism ; and, more fundamentally, the Messiahship of Jesus, and the altogether inferior dignity of the Baptist. It also bears out what was said a short while ago, that the baptism said to have been dispensed by Jesus' disciples, during His earthly life-time, was, in the view of the evangelist, sacramental.

9. In the remaining words of this section, we have a reminiscence of the synoptic account of the answer Jesus returned to the question, why His disciples did not fast. But it is introduced with a difference. The evangelist appears

tism alone satisfies their inner meaning, which is to impart a purification from sin ; and he goes on *τί γὰρ ὄφελος ἐκείνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ὃ τὸν σάρκα καὶ μόνον τὸ σῶμα φαιδρήνει* ; This seems exactly to correspond with the position of the Jew in the fourth Gospel.

to be anxious to exhibit the exact position held, and claimed, by John in the scheme of redemption. Thus, in the first place, he makes him recall his former affirmation that he is, not the Messiah but, the Messiah's forerunner. "Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but that, I am sent before Him." As the forerunner, his personality is completely merged in that of his Master. He is only the Bridegroom's friend; a necessary personage, but one who is quite overshadowed by the Bridegroom Himself. His own private solace consists in hearing the Bridegroom's voice; or, to drop the symbolic language, the forerunner will learn with joy, from the Messiah, far more than he himself can teach; and thus his importance is of necessity entirely eclipsed. "He must increase, but I must decrease." Now Jesus is the Messiah, because He has the gift of the Holy Ghost, which He is able to impart in baptism. The Messiah is the Bridegroom, and the Spirit is the Bride.<sup>129</sup> "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom." All this very precisely describes what we have already indicated to be the author's philosophic view of the historical position of the Baptist. And that being so, there can be no question about the authenticity of this particular incident; it does not pretend to be strictly historical.<sup>130</sup>

<sup>129</sup> Not the Nation or Church, as in the Synoptic account.

<sup>130</sup> To sum up a few of the counts :—John bears wit-

(Jn. x. 40-42.)

10. There is only one other passage in the fourth Gospel in which the Baptist's name is introduced; and that reminds us of the fears ascribed to Herod by the synoptists, when he heard of the miracles which Jesus was performing. Jesus, we are told, journeyed to the east of Jordan, to the place where John was at the first baptising, and where Jesus was Himself baptised; that is to Beth Nimrah. It is possible that this journey is intended to reproduce the retirement spoken of in *Mark x. 1*, and *Matthew xix. 1*, which immediately preceded the final journey to Jerusalem. By that time, some six months after the Baptist's execution, Jesus had attained a large measure of popularity; and many people sought Him out in His retreat. And it is very natural that He should seek to fortify Himself for His impending death, in the place where He had first arrived at His Messianic consciousness, and received that measure of Spiritual indwelling by which He had been enabled to accomplish His mission. We cannot mistake the polemical import of this

ness to Jesus as Messiah, but still holds aloof from Him, and does not cease baptising. In spite of his repeated declarations, John's disciples have not grasped Jesus' Messiahship, and are indignant at His encroachment upon their Master's functions. John is made to point to his waning popularity, at a time when he was at the summit of his fortunes, and Jesus almost unknown.

passage. It was evidently addressed to those who, being the evangelist's contemporaries, professed to regard the Baptist as Messiah. Our author casts back this opinion, as it were, to within a few months of the Baptist's death, and attempts to show how those who had, with some excuse, held it, were gradually led to see their mistake when they contemplated the work of Jesus, and contrasted it with John's. John did no miracles, he points out; while the ministry of Jesus was altogether compounded of the miraculous element. And this, in itself, was a clear proof of the Messiahship of the latter. But, if further proof were needed, John's life was given, so he asserts, to witnessing to Jesus; and the less testifies of the greater. And, still further, the testimony John bare to Jesus, in such words as "Behold the Lamb of God, which beareth the sin of the world," had been verified in the whole course of Christian experience, up to the time when the evangelist was writing; "all things whatsoever John spake of this man were true." The later Baptists could not claim anything like this for their master. And so the fourth evangelist puts a finishing touch to the portrait he has painted; but the features are those of Jesus; and the figure of the Baptist, dim and unsubstantial, flits almost unnoticed in the far shadowy background.

(Lk. xi. 1.)

11. Before leaving the Gospel sources, there

is one passage, upon which we have not at present touched, to which we may now advert. It is appropriate to deal with the question of the Baptist's prayer, in connection with that content of Christian experience to which we have just been referred. A religious teacher, who is sufficiently great as to create an epoch in his national history, introduces novel conceptions, which, like the wine and the bottles of Jesus' parable, cannot be cramped within the four corners of the old formularies. He indicates new fields for spiritual conquests, new principles in which the soul of man requires to be educated, new directions in which his spirit may realise a measure of self-expansion. So it was pre-eminently with Jesus; and so it was, in a lesser degree, with the Baptist. The rabbinical prayers, which seem to have been characterised by some poverty of thought and un-originality of expression previous to the Pharisaic reconstruction of religion at the Council of Jamnia,<sup>131</sup> evidently did not answer to the new needs; and some typical form of prayer was required, to give direction to the religious apprehension of the disciples. John had evidently met this request; but is it possible for us to tell at all, of what his sample prayer consisted? We know that the Lord's prayer drew largely upon

<sup>131</sup> The oldest pieces of the Jewish liturgy, which may in part have been contemporary with John, are the *Shēma*; the *Shēmmōnēh 'Esrēh*, in two recensions; the *Kaddish*; and the *Abinu Malkēnū*. cf. Dalman, "*Messianische Texte*," pp. 19-25.



old sources; and thus its originality, like so much of Jesus' ethical and religious teaching, to a great measure consisted in the way in which it combined, co-ordinated and remodelled, these older expressions of pious insight.<sup>132</sup> What would have been more natural, than that Jesus should have drawn upon the prayer of His forerunner, to whom he was in so many respects most intimately related? It may even be that some of the clauses in His prayer, which display a similarity to rabbinical expressions, had already filtered through the phraseology of the Baptist. We are too little acquainted with the teaching of John to hazard more than a few conjectures; but they will at least have a show of probability. "Forgive us our sins," as Luke has it, would almost certainly have been a feature in the prayer of him who preached "repentance unto remission of sins." Perhaps, too, "Lead us not into the temptation, but deliver us from the evil one;" would have been natural in the mouth of him who had cried, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" The phrase "Thy Kingdom come," might have found a place in the prayer, but that John's teaching of the Kingdom probably occupied only the last few weeks of his liberty. If we can regard *Lk. iii. 10-14* as an approximate representation of the Baptist's practical teaching, then his insistence upon the necessity of charity, honesty, peaceableness, justice and contentment, provide a

<sup>132</sup> See appended note

kind of equivalent to "Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." But all this is, to say the least, exceedingly dubious; and if it is legitimate to give the Baptist two clauses of the Lord's prayer, we must be content to confess that we cannot go further.<sup>133</sup>

<sup>133</sup> See appended note

## IX

### JOHN AND THE BAPTISTS IN THE ACTS

(Ac. i. 4<sup>b</sup>, 5, 21, 22 ; ii. 38 ; viii. 14-17 ; x. 36-38, 42-48 ; xiii. 23-25.)

1. In turning now to the Acts, if we assume, as there is abundance of reason for doing, that we owe its composition to the author of the third Gospel, then we shall be bound to treat it as a compilation of extracts from various sources ; for not only is this the author's avowed method of writing, but such a treatment alone appears to solve the many difficulties of the narrative.<sup>134</sup> Further, we are entitled to regard the different speeches and sermons found embedded in the book, not as *verbatim* reports, but as the artistic productions of the editor, after the manner which several classical authors followed, and Thucydides defended. But for the purposes of our

<sup>134</sup> cf. Schmiedel, in *Ency. Bib.* vol. i. cols. 43-46. Harnack, "*Acts of the Apostles*," chap. v. And for the date of Acts, cf. Harnack, "*Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*," p. 124.

investigation, the discussion of the authenticity of the sources is of no great moment; for in any case the references to John and the Baptists would reflect the current opinions and known facts of the period in which the book may be dated; that is to say, a little before the year 70 A.D. We may, in the first place then, examine a few passages, in which the baptism of John is contrasted with that of Jesus. On the occasion of the Ascension, our author puts into Jesus' mouth words which are an echo of those of the Baptist, reported in *Lk. iii. 16*. "John indeed baptised with water; but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Here the Spirit-baptism is directly referred to the gift of Pentecost. Putting on one side the evidence of the fourth evangelist, of which we saw reason to question the accuracy, this bears out the *argumentum e silentio* of the synoptists, in favour of the position that neither Jesus, nor His disciples, baptised in the days of His ministry. We conjectured that this absence of the supposed Messianic trait in Jesus, was one of the reasons which persuaded John that he had been mistaken. And to some extent his opinion was justified; for he was, to the last, probably ignorant of the fact that Jesus' Messiahship was a thing of the future. It was not until after Pentecost that Christian thought had been trained to see in the Ascension the assumption of the Messianic Kingdom, and to expect that outpouring of the Spirit which had hitherto

mysteriously been with-held.<sup>135</sup> Then at length the vision of Joel was actualised.

2. It seems likely that our author, or his authority, thought it desirable to explain why it was that Jesus was unable to dispense, during His earthly life, the endowment of the Spirit He had Himself received at His own baptism. For when the Apostles were choosing a successor to Judas, we are told that they required in the candidate one who had been with Jesus throughout His ministry, "beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that He was received up from us." These words suggest that His baptism at John's hands marked, not merely the historical commencement of the period of the ministry, but the reception of the power in, and by, which that ministry became possible. In other words, the spiritual endowment He then received was strictly personal, and not one in which others could participate, or which could be the fount of delegated treasures of grace. It is in full accordance with this that we find the commission to His disciples, to "go . . . and make disciples of all nations, baptising

<sup>135</sup> cf. Eulogius, quoted in Note 43 (δ). There was no sprinkling, or immersion, with water at Pentecost. It may be that the disciples were all of them baptised by John, and that the real gift was separated from the rite by an interval of time, similar to the case of the Samaritan Christians, Ac. viii. 16. They would clearly not have been re-baptised by Jesus, for the reason supplied in Jn. vii. 39: "For the Spirit was not yet; because Jesus was not yet glorified."

them,"<sup>136</sup> was not given until shortly before the Ascension; that is, it was given in view of Pentecost. It is of a piece with his view that Jesus' disciples did minister a sacramental baptism during the ministry, that the fourth evangelist (Jn. xx. 22) makes Jesus dispense the Spirit before the Ascension. This may perhaps be traced to Jesus' own belief, that His crucifixion would be in some sense sacramental; and that this baptism of blood was at least a necessary qualification for the imparting of a spiritual baptism to others. Here we have a partial interpretation of those obscure words in Luke (xii. 49, 50), "I came to cast fire upon the earth; and what will I? Would that it were already kindled! But I have a baptism to be baptised with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." This is a resuscitation of the old sacrificial idea, and is therefore strictly sacramental, of a baptism by blood for the purification of sin. In the case of Jesus the baptismal suffering is vicarious, and is to be followed by an out-

<sup>136</sup> Mt. xxviii. 19. The Trinitarian formula of baptism is undoubtedly a product of theological development; the original would have been "into the name of Jesus Christ," Ac. ii. 38. cf. Harnack, "*Constitution and Law of the Church*," p. 270, and the whole of App. ii.; Chase, "*Journal of Theological Studies*," vol. vi. pp. 481-512. J. A. Robinson, *J.T.S.*, vol. vii. pp. 186-202. Chase, *J.T.S.*, vol. viii. pp. 161-184. The Paschal gift of the Spirit is clearly not baptismal, as the Pentecostal may, in a sense, be confirmational; but it is rather ministerial. cf. Mason, "*Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*," p. 469.

pouring of spiritually cleansing fire; a gift He is unable to bestow until His baptism has been achieved.<sup>137</sup> The idea receives a sort of illustration in Jesus' ambiguous assurance, given to the sons of Zebedee in response to their request that they might sit in the seats of highest honour in His Kingdom: "The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptised withal shall ye be baptised" (Mk. x. 39); by which words the brothers were given to understand that they would be permitted to share in the sufferings and death of their Master, and would find in them, as would be His own experience, a sacramental baptism and an accession of spiritual power, far in excess of their paltry anticipations of temporal dignity and precedence.<sup>138</sup>

3. In the course of his sermon on the day of Pentecost, Peter is represented as referring, and exhorting, to baptism, in language which recalls that of the Baptist, but with a marked difference. "Repent ye," he says, "and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Christian baptism, as deriving from Jesus, is to establish

<sup>137</sup> We must punctuate καὶ τί θέλω; εἰ ἤδη ἀνήψθη. "And what will I? Would that it were already kindled!" cf. Plummer, "*St. Luke*," p. 334. The "fire" is not, here, a symbol of strife and contention, but of purification and remission of sins.

<sup>138</sup> See appended note

a definite relationship, cleanse of sin, and impart a spiritual power; all of which John's baptism lacked. In other words, while it is held to be inclusive of the subjective value of the Baptist's symbolic rite, it also possesses the additional objective gift of the indwelling of the Spirit, and all which that may be supposed to imply. It is true that we find the gift is not infrequently dissociated from the rite, as was probably the case with the Apostles themselves. A case in point ~~was~~ that of the Samaritan Christians, converted and baptised by Philip the evangelist; for Peter and John, we are told, were subsequently sent down to impart to them the Holy Ghost, since "as yet he was fallen upon none of them; only they had been baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus." It would not be relevant to our enquiry to discuss here, whether there had already arisen a differentiation of ministerial power, according to which only the Apostolic band was able to convey the full gift of baptism, while baptism by another, such as Philip, was no more than an equivalent to a profession of faith; or whether the gift of the Holy Ghost here spoken of was no more than that of a spiritual power, of a temporary charismatic character; or whether we may find in the passage an allusion to that dichotomy of the baptismal gift, whereby the rite of confirmation originated. But it is at least a plausible suggestion that baptism was, thus early, regarded as conveying, not so much the continuous presence of the Spirit, as a gift from



Him; that is to say, an operation for the particular purpose of the remission of sin.<sup>139</sup> If this is so, the primitive Christian baptism would sufficiently have fulfilled the anticipation of John's rite, and could justly have been contrasted with it.

4. In Peter's address, delivered at the house of Cornelius, we have an interesting summary of many of the points we have already noticed. The "word" which God sent to Israel, we read, was a "gospel of peace" preached by Jesus; that is, a declaration of remission of sins.<sup>140</sup> This followed upon "the baptism which John preached," in both temporal and spiritual succession; for John's baptism was one of repentance only. Moreover, Jesus was enabled to discharge His mission and declare His message, because "God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost and with power;" or, in other words, the baptism of Jesus at the hands of John conveyed to Him a personal gift, and that only. And, further, Peter appeals to the fact that Jesus had given him a commission to declare, that faith in Him, presumably as a condition of baptism,

<sup>139</sup> For a discussion of the question, cf. Rackham, *"Acts of the Apostles,"* p. 117; Moberly, *"Atonement and Personality,"* pp. 260-265; Gore, *"The Church and the Ministry,"* pp. 235-237, 243 (cp. *Ac.* ix. 17, 18, the baptism of Saul); Mason, *"Relation of Confirmation to Baptism,"* pp. 18-23.

<sup>140</sup> cf. Eph. ii. 11-22. A peaceful fraternity of Jewish and Gentile elements in the Church was possible, because each had first established a peace, or reconciliation, with God through the blood of Jesus.

would appropriate to the individual believer the remission of sins which Jesus had preached. The conclusion of Peter's address is signalled by the descent of the Spirit upon the assembled company; a gift which is obviously of the temporary charismatic order, for they at once began to speak with tongues; but which may also have been that fulness of spiritual indwelling which is the complete baptismal gift, and which lay behind this partial manifestation of it. This evidence of God's favour is followed, appropriately enough, by their baptism; which conveyed, we may suppose, that particular spiritual operation, the property of which was to purify the recipients of their sins.<sup>141</sup> A comparison with the account of this incident which Peter gives at Jerusalem,<sup>142</sup> on the whole appears to substantiate the interpretation given above, though the language employed is not free of difficulty. Peter says that the Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius' household, "even as on us at the beginning." He remembered Jesus' words at the Ascension, that "John indeed baptised with

<sup>141</sup> cf. Rackham, "Acts," p. 159.

<sup>142</sup> cf. Ac. xi. 15-18. Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄρξασθαι με λαλεῖν ἐπέπεσεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὥσπερ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἄρχῃ. ἐμνήσθην δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς ἔλεγεν Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. εἰ οὖν τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν πιστεύσασιν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐγὼ τίς ἡμῖν δυνατὸς κωλύσαι τὸν θεόν; ἀκούσαντες δὲ ταῦτα ἡσύχασαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες Ἄρα καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν ἔδωκεν.

water; but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost." The gift Cornelius had received was "the like gift" to that which the Apostles received, "when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ." And Peter's view was acquiesced in by the rest of the Apostles, who perceived that God had granted to the Gentiles also, "repentance unto life." Now, in the first place, it is quite clear that Peter and the rest viewed Pentecost, which was marked by so extraordinary a display of charismatic powers, as their own baptism in the Spirit. That was, to them, a "beginning," not merely of their missionary activities, but of their new spiritual life. It marked a moment when their "belief" in Jesus became, for the first time, distinct and unequivocal. They then received a divine illumination, which enabled them to know Jesus, no longer after the flesh, but as the Divine Messiah who had at length ascended His throne, and taken upon Him the reins of government. So far as we can tell, the Apostles had never received the rite of baptism by water; though it is quite possible that they may all have been baptised with John's baptism. In that case, a repetition of the ceremony may have been regarded as superfluous; while the substance of the rite was immediately conveyed to them at Pentecost. But in the case of Cornelius and his household, undoubtedly it was deemed fitting that the form of baptism should follow upon the fact.<sup>143</sup> But

<sup>143</sup> cf. Moberly, "*Ministerial Priesthood*," p. 108.

why? It is indeed possible to say that, while the rite of baptism as a general rule symbolised the synchronous gift of the Spirit, where that gift had already been conveyed, the symbol which followed upon, but did not accompany, the fact, was intended to ratify it in a public fashion. In that case, the baptism of Cornelius and the others with water, was no more than an official enrolment of them in the Church, of which their implicit membership could not be denied. But against this view we may urge, that the descent of the Spirit upon them was of a special character, giving the recipients, together with the indwelling Presence, peculiar powers. It was, that is, a clear indication of God's will in respect of them, marking out for them certain activities in relation to the Gospel, such as the Apostles had themselves recognised at Pentecost; and it was, therefore, something other, and more, than a personal reconciliation with God. Thus there can be no reason why, in their case, we should denude the rite of baptism of its ordinary significance, by which it is a gift of the Spirit for the remission of sins. And it is this aspect of the question which the Apostles emphasised, when they declared that the baptism had been both a token of repentance, and a channel to life in the Spirit, which is the natural fruit of forgiveness.

5. On what is known as his first missionary journey, Paul is reported as preaching in the Jews' synagogue at the Pisidian Antioch. After

a short historical *resumé*, in which he traces the growth of the conception of the rise of a king, who should come of the root of Jesse, a son of David; he goes on to declare that Jesus is that King, whom God had sent to be the Saviour of Israel, "when John had first preached, before his entrance,<sup>144</sup> the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel. And as John was fulfilling his course, he said, What suppose ye that I am? I am not (he). But, behold, there cometh one after me, the shoes of whose feet I am not worthy to unloose."<sup>145</sup> It will not be necessary for us to dwell again upon the baptism, the announcement of the Messiah, and the denial by John that he is himself that Personage. But it is worth noticing that Paul is careful to insist upon the position which, as a matter of history, the

<sup>144</sup> Εἰσόδοος corresponds to ἐξόδοος. The immediate forerunner, as it were, flings wide the door for the entrance of the Messiah. cf. Rackham, "Acts," p. 212.

<sup>145</sup> As in the Synoptists, the Baptist's work is two-fold: to preach repentance, and to bear witness to Jesus. "Fulfilling his course," is an athletic phrase equivalent to the Pauline "running the race that is set before me;" it means "discharging the duties of his office," i.e. in the midst of his baptising. The implication of the Messiahship, and the reference to the coming One, are a reminiscence of Lk. iii. 15, 16. Τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι, ὃνκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ, (a possible punctuation) "What ye suppose me to be, (that) am not I," is interesting. John denies that he is the holder of the Messianic office, which is conceived of in the abstract, apart from the Person who holds it. The coming One, whose slave the Baptist is not worthy to be, is to be that Person.

Baptist actually occupied. He evidently knew that the suggestion had been made, and the opinion entertained, that John was indeed the Messiah; and it is interesting to see how Luke, as the editor of the Acts and the third Gospel, obtained his information from a source which emanated from the same lands as did that of the fourth Gospel, namely Asia Minor. If the error did not originate in that country, and was not confined to it, at least it obtained its widest vogue there. And perhaps we may assume that Paul had some of this persuasion in his audience on this occasion; Jews who, even if they did not account John the Messiah, were at least inclined, eighteen years after his death,<sup>146</sup> to support the Baptist's claims to that dignity, against those of Jesus.

(Ac. xviii. 24—xix. 7.)

6. We come now to two incidents, closely related to each other, which are of great interest in themselves, and of high importance to our investigation. The first is the case of Apollos. This man was a Jew of Alexandria, who came to Ephesus shortly after Paul's visit to that city on his way to Cæsarea, at the close of the second

<sup>146</sup> John was executed in the early summer of 29 A.D.; and Paul was at the Pisidian Antioch in the winter of 47 A.D.; which gives 18 years and a few months. cf. Ramsay, "*St. Paul the Traveller*," p. 68, and "*The Church in the Roman Empire*," pp. 66, 67.

missionary journey. He was, we are told, well-versed in the scriptures of the Old Testament, and eloquent in expounding them; and he "had been instructed in the Way of the Lord." The term "Way" has, doubtless, a somewhat technical meaning in this connection; and perhaps we may take it to imply the simple religion of the Old Testament, freed from the later accretions of scribal tradition, and given a point by the Messianic predictions of the Baptist.<sup>147</sup> In this "Way," by certain disciples of the Baptist at Alexandria, Apollos had been orally instructed, after the manner of the scribal teaching in the synagogues.<sup>148</sup> Looking himself for a Messiah of the Davidic line, he spoke fervently, and taught with diligent care and exactitude, of the Coming One; or, in our author's phrase, "he spake and taught carefully the things concerning Jesus;" the things, -that is, which applied to Jesus, in the whole range of Messianic prophecy and typology, though he was so far ignorant of the fact.<sup>149</sup> The Baptist's spirit, which was essentially that of prophetic Hebraism, seems to have struck a responsive chord of profound sympathy in this Alexandrian Jew; and we are not surprised to learn that he had received the

<sup>147</sup> See appended note

<sup>148</sup> We hear of no Christian Church<sup>c</sup> at Alexandria; and, while Apollos would certainly have heard there of John's predictions of the Coming One, he would not have been likely to hear of Jesus Himself. For *κατηχίσθαι* as oral teaching, see Ro. ii. 17, 18.

<sup>149</sup> See appended note

baptism of John, of which alone he knew. Now Aquila and Priscilla, we are told, heard him preach; and they appear to have been greatly impressed by his genius and piety; for "they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the Way of God more carefully." We may hazard a guess as to what their instruction would have been. They would have drawn his attention especially to the suffering-Servant passages, and shewn him how they were naturally and satisfactorily fulfilled in the Person and Work of Jesus; they would have dwelt upon the life of Him of Nazareth, and pointed out that while He was certainly the focus of the Baptist's Messianic predictions, John, who was himself, in his own measure, the fulfilment of prophecy, was entirely eclipsed by the brighter Light to whom he bare witness. The result of this instruction was, that Apollos offered himself, and was enthusiastically accepted, as a missionary of the Christian faith; and he was able to prove, with some success, to the Corinthian Jews, out of the prophetic scriptures, that Jesus was the Messiah. Re-baptism in his case would not have been judged necessary, perhaps; but he would certainly have received the Spirit by the imposition of the hands, either of Aquila, or of Paul at a later period. The importance of Apollos for our purpose is twofold. In the first place he is a link in the chain of evidence, which goes to prove the existence of a wide-spreading body of disciples who owed allegiance to the



Baptist; a fact which witnesses to the extraordinary popularity John must have evoked in his life-time. Here we see one of the ramifications of this sect in Alexandria, and another taking root in Ephesus; and possibly we may take it that it had its chief centre at Corinth; for Apollos' eagerness to pass over into Achaia is that of a convert whose chief aim is to lead his former companions to follow in his steps. And, in the second place, Apollos, who was perhaps in the position of a leader of this sect, did not yet identify the Baptist with the figure of the Messiah; from which we may argue that this identification was evolved at a later period, and was the product of that friction of opinion between the Baptists and Christians, which would have arisen out of the high claims the latter made for their Master.

7. The second of the two incidents we are considering, occurred also at Ephesus, some little while after the departure of Apollos to Corinth. Upon his arrival at that city, in the course of his third missionary journey, possibly about the year 56 A.D., and twenty-seven years after the execution of the Baptist, Paul encounters twelve disciples, at the entrance to the synagogue, it may be, while the congregation were assembling for prayers. The narrative makes it quite clear that they were not Christians, unless the author is reflecting back the subsequent fact to the period before their baptism. But it is more natural to suppose that they were disciples of

the Baptist; members, that is, of the Baptist sect, and probably converts of Apollos in his pre-Christian days. If that is so, evidently Apollos had not been able to carry them with him in the step he had taken; and Aquila and Priscilla had, possibly, no personal knowledge of them. But we may conjecture that Apollos, learning of Paul's plans, had communicated with them from Corinth, and referred them to the Apostle himself. Thus they would have accosted him, with a request for information, at the most natural place of meeting. This supposition explains the question that Paul addressed to them: "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?"—a form of words which takes us back to Peter's explanation, rendered to the Apostles at Jerusalem, of the reasons which led him to baptise Cornelius. The meaning is quite plain; he wanted to know whether they were conscious of an outpouring of the Spirit when they were baptised. Baptism into the name of Jesus, and the belief in Jesus which that baptism ratifies, are interchangeable terms. But there can be no doubt that Paul was, for the moment, under a misapprehension; for he takes it for granted that these men who have approached him are Christian disciples, and he speaks to them familiarly of their belief. And yet something strange and unexpected in their question, prompts him to ask whether they have really grasped one of the fundamentals of the Christian position, namely the Spirit-

baptism.<sup>150</sup> That they are equally puzzled by his question is shown by their answer; for they ignore his implication of belief, and fasten upon that which most attracted their attention. They are quite ignorant of his meaning when he speaks to them of the Spirit being imparted in baptism. Not, indeed, that a doctrine of the Spirit was new to them; or that they had never heard of John's prediction of the Spirit-baptism; but rather that they had had no proof, so far, of what Christian baptism implied. This would go to bear out the position that Apollos had not received the Spirit before his departure for Corinth. "Nay," they said, "we did not even hear whether a Holy Ghost is"—"is given in baptism," that is, or "exists in connection with baptism."<sup>151</sup> Immediately there follows Paul's startled enquiry, "Into what then were ye baptised?" and their answer, "Into John's baptism," at once makes the matter clear. They were Baptists; a sect of which Paul had at present, perhaps, but little personal acquaintance. And they had probably received their baptism, not at the hands of John, but from Apollos. Paul, having cleared up this misunderstanding, at once proceeds to answer their queries, and to give them the information they desired. "John

<sup>150</sup> cf. Heb. vi. 1, 2.

<sup>151</sup> cf. Rackham, "*Acts*," p. 346. "Into what," says Paul, using the opening of the familiar formula, "Into the name of Jesus Christ;" but "into what name" he could not say; nor could the Twelve in their reply.

baptised with the baptism of repentance," he says; "saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Jesus." He shows them, in other words, the incomplete nature of John's baptism; he informs them that the Baptist's mission lay, primarily, not in his baptising so much as in the witness he gave to Jesus; and he points out that, in John's own estimation, Jesus was the Messiah whose advent he preached. In all this Paul appears to have been more convincing than Apollos, notwithstanding the eloquence of the latter's wisdom; and perhaps we may attribute this to the fact that Apollos did not yet possess the Spirit. The narrative, like the preceding one, is left in a somewhat unfinished condition; but we may suppose that Paul then went on to explain that Jesus' baptism contained what John's lacked, in that it imparted the Spirit for the remission of sins and the gift of a new life; for now the twelve were fully persuaded to be baptised, and themselves received the coveted blessing. It is not easy to understand why the twelve should have been re-baptised. Re-baptism had not been considered necessary in the case of Apollos; unless indeed the narrative in this point has been curtailed. And it is not quite in harmony with Paul's methods to insist, on his arrival, upon a novel procedure in such cases, without any good reason being alleged for it.<sup>152</sup>

<sup>152</sup> cf. Ramsay, "*St. Paul the Traveller*," p. 270, who gives it up.

But it may well be that the narrative has been touched by a later hand, and reflects a different set of circumstances. Such circumstances would have arisen, when the Baptists came to claim their founder as the Messiah, and when, as we shall later on see to have been the case, their custom of a single baptism of repentance assimilated itself to the daily purificatory washings of another Jewish fraternity; for then the sect would have become a distinct heresy, in sharp conflict with the Church of Jesus, and a policy of re-baptism would have been both reasonable and necessary. But, up to the present, we have only the first inchoate form of an opinion, which was afterwards to develop larger proportions, as it came in conflict with the Christian idea.

## X

### THE GROWTH OF THE BAPTIST SECT

1. In the course of our enquiry we have, both in the Gospels and in Acts, met with traces of a Baptist sect, existing side by side with, and yet distinct from, the Christian community. We have seen that there is reason to suspect that this sect originated with John himself, and arose from that attitude of aloofness which he finally adopted towards Jesus; though it is not likely that the claim to be the Messiah was ever made on his behalf during his life-time; and though it is probable that, to the end, he resisted any attempts to glorify him. At least it seems that we are constrained to admit that he formed a band of disciples around his person, who obeyed certain rules, such as that of fasting at stated periods, and who were initiated into his following by the rite of baptism, when that rite, in his ministry, ceased to have a Messianic significance. There is only one other passage in the New Testament which appears to have any reference to the Baptist sect and its claims; and with this our

chain of scriptural witness comes to an end. In *1 John v. 6*, we read, "This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood."<sup>153</sup> The author certainly has in view Jesus' Baptism and Death; and he probably calls to mind the flow of blood and water from His pierced side, recorded in the fourth Gospel. But his reiteration of the fact that Jesus came not by water alone, but by blood also, evidently points to the conclusion that he is attempting to counteract the spread of certain erroneous opinions. He is drawing a distinction between a baptism which is no more than a purificatory rite by water, and one which, while it employs water, depends for its real efficacy upon the life-giving properties of Jesus' death; "we were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life."<sup>154</sup> And this distinction exactly differentiates the Johannine and the Christian baptisms. Thus it seems probable that it is the Baptist sect, and their tenets, of which the writer is thinking.

2. Is it possible to trace the early history of this sect, and to define its relation to the Christian

<sup>153</sup> Οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός· οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι· cf. Westcott, "*The Epistles of St. John*," pp. 181-183.

<sup>154</sup> Ro. vi. 4.

Church? The attempt must be made; though our conclusions, based upon very meagre and fragmentary sources of information, must remain highly speculative. We have, in the first place, to direct our attention to the so-called Hemerobaptists; a Jewish sect which owed its origin to a development, at about the beginning of the Christian era, of ritual washings for the purifying of moral offences; and which seems, at a later date, to have had certain affinities with Christian heretical bodies.<sup>155</sup> It is possible that the Hemerobaptists may have been an off-shoot of the Essenes; but so far as our evidence extends, and it is very slight, they appear to have had but this one feature, that of continuous washings, in common; and this they also shared with the stricter Jewish circles. The witness of Epiphanius,<sup>156</sup> who wrote towards the end of the fourth century, is of no considerable value on the question as to what were their tenets, and what their points of contact with other Jewish sects; but we have references to the sect in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, a work which was probably produced at Antioch about the year

<sup>155</sup> Lightfoot, "*Colossians and Philemon*," pp. 366, 367, 400-405; equates the ἡμεροβαπτισταὶ with the שבלי שחרית spoken of in Tosifta, "*Yadayim*," c. 2. Schürer, *H.J.P.*, II. ii. p. 210, note 91, says that the sect is fabricated, and only indicates a general Jewish custom; a scepticism which evades, but does not explain, the evidence.

<sup>156</sup> See appended note



A.D. 375.<sup>157</sup> Amongst a list of Jewish sects, whose opinions are stated ; a list which comprises the Sadducees, Pharisees, Basmotheans, Ebionites and Essenes ; we find the Hemerobaptists, "who every day, unless they wash, do not eat, — nay, and unless they cleanse their beds and tables, or platters and cups and seats, do not make use of any of them."<sup>158</sup> So far, there is nothing to distinguish these washings from the ceremonial purifications of the Pharisees ; but in another passage we find an allusion to a daily baptism, undoubtedly that practised by members of this sect, in which a cleansing from sin appears to be indicated. "He (i.e. Jesus)," we read, "has in several ways changed baptism ; . . . for instead of daily baptisms, He has given only one, which is that into His death."<sup>159</sup> The reference in another place is rather more dubious. It reads ; "Be ye likewise contented with one baptism alone, that which is into the death of the Lord ; not that which is conferred by wicked heretics, but that which is conferred by unblamable priests ; . . . and let not that which comes from the ungodly be received by you, nor let that which is done by the godly be disannulled by a second. For as there is one God, one Christ, and one Comforter, and one death of the Lord in

<sup>157</sup> Wordsworth, "*Ministry of Grace*," p. 45.

<sup>158</sup> *Apost. Const.* vi. 6.

<sup>159</sup> *Apost. Const.* vi. 23.

the body, so let that baptism which is unto Him be but one."<sup>160</sup> Undoubtedly the writer is here thinking of all those sects who claimed the right, which the Church claimed, to re-baptise in the case of converts; but his thought covers and includes the Hemerobaptists. From the *Apostolical Constitutions* we travel backwards to the *Clementine Homilies*, which may, perhaps, be dated in the middle of the third century; and there we find that John himself is spoken of as a Hemerobaptist, in a passage to which we shall return in another connection.<sup>161</sup> Hegesippus, writing about the year A.D. 160, enumerates several sects, amongst which appear the Hemerobaptists.<sup>162</sup> On the strength of this evidence, therefore, we may say that the sect was well known in the first four centuries; that its main tenet was the necessity of a daily ablution of a quasi-sacramental character; that, though Jewish in origin, it for some reason came into a sort of competition with the Christian Church on the

<sup>160</sup> *Apost. Const.* vi. 15.

<sup>161</sup> *Clement. Hom.* ii. 23. On the Homilies, an Ebionite production, cf. Westcott, "*Canon of the New Testament*," pp. 285-291; Lightfoot, "*Apostolic Fathers*," I. i. pp. 100, 361.

<sup>162</sup> Quoted in Eusebius, *H.E.*, iv. 22: Ἦσαν δὲ γινώμαι διάφοροι ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ τῶν κατὰ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰουδα καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐταὶ Ἑσσαῖοι, Γαλιλαῖοι, Ἡμεροβαπτισταὶ, Μασβώθαιοι, Σαμαρεῖται, Φαρισαῖοι. On the date of Hegesippus, cf. Lightfoot, "*Apost. Fathers*," II. i. p. 451; Wordsworth, "*Min. of Grace*," p. 127.

question of baptism; and that its influence was sufficiently great to warrant Epiphanius' pains in the refutation of its errors.

3. From the Hemerobaptists we turn to the obscure sect of the Dositheans, of whom we glean some particulars "in the pages of Epiphanius."<sup>163</sup> It appears that Dositheus was of Jewish antecedents; and that he espoused the Samaritan heresy previous to giving rein to his own convictions. His peculiar tenets, differentiating him from the Samaritans, are said to have included a belief in the doctrine of the resurrection, the establishment of an ecclesiastical polity, abstention from animal food, strictness in sexual relations, the observance of circumcision and of the Sabbath, the prohibition of all intercourse with strangers, and the cultivation of rigorous ascetic habits. Doubtless there is much confusion, and a characteristic display of inaccuracy in this description; but we may perhaps see, in the customs of the Dositheans, traces of those rules of life to which the Essenes bound themselves. At a considerably later date, Photius states that the Dositheans declared their founder to have been the Messiah.<sup>164</sup> In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, Dositheus is mentioned as a false apostle who attempted to undermine the work of Peter, and the leader of a sect which comprised amongst its members

<sup>163</sup> See appended note

<sup>164</sup> Photius, "*Bibliotheca*," code 230. cf. Schechter, "*Documents*," vol. i. p. xxiv.

Simon Magus, and one Cleobius.<sup>165</sup> The *Clementine Recognitions*, and the *Clementine Homilies* which present us with two versions of the same romance, and which both belong to the third century, give us a curious tale of the relations of Dositheus with Simon Magus. According to these authorities, John Baptist, who is said to have practised daily-baptism, had in his life-time thirty principal disciples, of whom the chief was Simon. Upon John's death, Simon being away in Egypt, Dositheus claimed the leadership of the sect. He seems to have proclaimed himself the Messiah, or the "Standing One." But when Simon returned, he discovered that his pretensions were eclipsed by the superior magical powers of the other; and, resigning his usurped authority, he shortly afterwards died.<sup>166</sup> It is important to notice that

<sup>165</sup> *Apost. Const.* vi. 8. Ἡγίκα δὲ ἐξήλθομεν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι κηρύσσειν τὸν λόγον τῆς ζωῆς, τότε ἐνήργησεν ὁ διάβολος εἰς τὸν λαὸν, ἀποστῆλαι ὁπίσω ἡμῶν ψευδαποστόλους εἰς βεβήλωσιν τοῦ λόγου· καὶ προεβάλοντο Κλεόβιον τινα καὶ παρέζευξαν τῷ Σίμωνι· οὗτοι δὲ μαθητεύουσι Δοσιθέω τινὶ, ὃν καὶ παρενδοκίμησαντες ἐξώσαντο τῆς ἀρχῆς. This Cleobius, or Cleobulus, is mentioned in the *Pseudo-Ignatian Ep. to the Trallians* (which is largely dependent upon the *Apost. Const.*) xi. Φεύγετε καὶ τὰ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἔγγονα, Θεόδοτον καὶ Κλεόβουλον κ.τ.λ. cp. Eriphanius, "*Ad. Haer.*" II. i. xxxi. 6. Καὶ Κλεόβιον, εἵτουν Κλεόβουλον. cf. Lightfoot, "*Apost. Fathers*," II. iii. pp. 162, 163. See also *Apost. Const.* vi. 16, Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι οἱ περὶ Σίμωνα καὶ Κλεόβιον ἰώδη συντάξαντες βιβλία ἐπ' ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ περιφέρουσιν.

<sup>166</sup> See appended note

Hegesippus speaks of Simon, Dositheus and Cleobius, as being the leaders of three separate sects;<sup>167</sup> but at any rate his distinctions argue a certain similarity, and perhaps a common origin. Putting on one side the legendary accounts of Dositheus and his companions, we must probably allow something to the tradition which would establish some sort of connection between himself and John Baptist. Our authorities, moreover, while they display a considerable ignorance of the origin of various Jewish sects, yet agree in placing the beginning of a flood of sectarian divisions at about the time of John's death.<sup>168</sup> These sects, each one of them, appear to have regarded their founder as the Messiah; and we have evidence, both in the *Clementine Recognitions*, and in Justin Martyr, who wrote about the year 150 A.D., that John's disciples also regarded him as the Messiah, after his death.<sup>169</sup> Simon Magus and Dositheus are both

<sup>167</sup> Hegesippus, quoted in Eusebius, *H.E.*, iv. 22.  
 Ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ αἵρεσεων, (ὧν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ λαῷ ἀφ' ὧν Σίμων, ὅθεν οἱ Σιμωνιανοὶ καὶ Κλεόβιος, ὅθεν Κλεοβιηνοὶ, καὶ Δοσίθεος, ὅθεν Δοσιθεανοὶ, κ.τ.λ.).

<sup>168</sup> cf. *Clement. Recog.* i. 53. \* "Cumque crebro deposcerent, ut de Jesu aut discerent, aut docerent, si ipse esset Christus; visum nobis est ascendere ad templum, et coram omni populo protestari de eo, simul et arguere Judaeos de multis, quae ab eis absurde gerebantur. In multas etenim jam partes populus scindebatur, initio sumpto a Johanne Baptista." (Peter is speaking).

<sup>169</sup> See appended note

treated, in the *Clementine Recognitions*, as having sprung from the Sadducees; and Dositheus in particular, we are told, hindered the Samaritans from believing that Jesus was the Messiah.<sup>170</sup>

4. Now we have already seen, in our study of the Scriptural evidence, that John Baptist, towards the end of his career, gathered around him a body of disciples, who would have formed the nucleus of the sect which subsequently became known as the Baptists. After John's death, and following upon his waning popularity amongst the Judæan populace, and the growing interest in Jesus, it is quite possible that his disciples may have directed their attention more particularly to Samaria, as forming a more profitable field for their activities. If Simon and Dositheus were indeed his adherents, and they were both of them Samaritans, such a course would be reasonable enough. Simon, we know, studied in Egypt; and the main seats of the Dosithean sect appear to have been in Southern Palestine and Egypt.<sup>171</sup> Thus we can account for the spread of John's fame and teaching southwards to Alexandria; whence it was carried by Apollos to Asia Minor. If Simon and Dositheus, as successive leaders of the

<sup>170</sup> *Clement. Recog.* i. 54. "Qui tamen" (i.e., the Samaritans) "unum verum Prophetam ex Moysis vaticinationibus recte expectantis, pravitate Dosithei impediti sunt, ne hunc quem expectabant, crederent esse Jesum."

<sup>171</sup> cf. Schechter: "*Documents*," vol. i. p. xxvi.

Baptist sect, each gave out in turn that he was the "Standing One," or the Messiah; we have a ground for the later belief of the sect, which claimed to have found the Messiah in the person of John himself. Simon appears to have found little profit in his leadership of the Baptists; and he is represented in Acts as making a bid for a high position in the new sect of Christians, of whom he had heard that they dispensed great magical powers by the gift of the Holy Spirit. At a later date he developed opinions which may be classified as Gnostic. We know nothing of the reasons which prompted Cleobius and Dositheus (if we follow the guidance of Epiphanius rather than the *Clementines* upon the question of his death) to forsake the Baptists; but it is probable that the sect found a leader in Apollōs for some little while. It cannot be considered strange that we have no reference in the Pauline epistles to the Baptists; for the sect was naturally regarded as a Jewish, and not a Christian, body; and Paul, whose work lay mainly amongst the Gentiles, would have had but little cognizance of the opinions of Jewish sectaries. If he nowhere mentions John himself, he would not be likely to bestow much attention upon John's adherents. Moreover, the picture in Acts of his meeting with the twelve Baptists, is a sufficient indication of his ignorance of, and lack of interest in, their opinions. It seems probable that it was in Asia Minor that the Baptists were first brought into connection with the Hemero-

baptists. The sect, weakened by numerous secessions to Christianity, and by internal disruptions, would have quickly assimilated itself to a body with which it had the rite of baptism, at the least, in common. And the conjunction of the two sects would have had the natural effect of modifying the opinions of both. The Baptists would have extended their purificatory practices to the standard of their friends; while the Hemerobaptists would have accepted John as their Master. Very soon John would have been regarded as a Hemerobaptist himself; and, since he was held to be the Messiah, the baptism would have become sacramental, and the means of imparting the Spirit. These complementary dogmatic positions would have brought the sect into a position of antagonism to the Christian Church; and, in the end, the amalgamation of the two Jewish bodies would have produced a Christian heresy.

5. There is yet one possible source of information, upon which we must now spend some thought. It is, doubtless, too early in the day to use, for strictly historical purposes, the so-called "*Zadokite*" document, while its date, its parentage, and even its *provenance*, are still matters of critical enquiry.<sup>172</sup> But it may be of interest, in a provisional fashion, to notice what

<sup>172</sup> cf. Schechter: "*Documents of Jewish Sectaries*," vol. i. The editor dates the document circ. 176-150 B.C., and attributes it to a Zadokite sect, who were perhaps of Sadducean origin, and who became incorporated in the Dositheans.



the bearing of that document upon our present investigation is likely to be, should the attractive contention of G. Margoliouth come to be generally accepted.<sup>173</sup> The story of the sect may be briefly related. The Sadducean party traced their origin to a certain Zadok; of whom next to nothing is known; but in speaking of themselves as the "sons of Zadok," the Sadducean priesthood probably claimed at least a spiritual lineage from Zadok, the priest of the age of David.<sup>174</sup> A section of the Sadducean party, distinguished by their peculiar devotion to the *Torah*, and amongst whom may have flowered certain of the *pseudepigrapha*, formed themselves into a religious community which came to be known as the Boëthusians, after their leader, the priest Boëthos.<sup>175</sup> It is possible that we have a reference to these Boëthusians, who were not the whole, but 'a portion only of the Sadducees, in the *Clementine Recognitions*; where we read, "The first schism, therefore, was that of those who were called Sadducees, which took their rise almost in the time of John. These, as more righteous than others, began to separate themselves from the assembly of the

<sup>173</sup> cf. G. Margoliouth, in "*Journal of Theol. Studies*," vol. xii. pp. 446-450; "*Expositor*," 8th series, vol. ii. pp. 499-517; vol. iii. pp. 213-235. See also a review of Schechter by W. E. Barnes, in *J.T.S.* vol. xii. pp. 301-303. The whole argument in the text, but for a few details, is indebted to Margoliouth.

<sup>174</sup> See appended note

<sup>175</sup> See appended note

people.”<sup>176</sup> If that is so, then we may find in them another sect which owed its existence to the influence of the Baptist; and that will go far to explain why, as we shall see, they regarded John as the Messiah. It appears that these sectaries were profoundly impressed by the life and teaching of Jesus, to whose conviction and execution they were strongly opposed.<sup>177</sup> It is quite likely that they were won in a body to Christianity, not long after the foundation of the Church at Jerusalem, and that we may identify them with the “great company of the priests (who) were obedient to the faith,” spoken of in *Acts, vi. 7*. If so, then we may take it that, in the persecution which arose after the martyrdom of Stephen, many of these Sadducean converts were amongst the dispersed, and perhaps already found a refuge at Damascus. This would account for the great migration of their co-religionists thither at a later date; and it would also throw a flood of light upon the life history of Saul the Pharisee. It is possible to see in Stephen, “a man full of faith, and of the Holy Spirit,” a converted Sadducean priest. For while his opponents, we are told, “were not able to withstand the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake,” and were obliged to suborn men to proffer against him the false charge, “we have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God;” at the same time we find

<sup>176</sup> *Clement. Recog.* i. 54.

<sup>177</sup> See appended note

Stephen himself expressing a reverence for the Mosaic Law before the *Synedrium*; "ye who received the law as the ordinances of angels, and kept it not." In other words, he displays the temper of the Sadducean reformers, as against Pharisaic Rabbinism. And then, we are told, "Saul was consenting unto his death."<sup>178</sup> This was the future Apostle's first overt act of hostility towards the Christians; and from that time forward he became exceedingly active in the work of persecution.<sup>179</sup> But it is quite possible that his antagonism was prompted by a particular motive, which would explain his selection of Damascus for his further efforts. We may suppose that, being "exceedingly zealous for the traditions" of the fathers,<sup>180</sup> he would have felt a very peculiar bitterness towards priests who had become apostates; and in such circumstances he would willingly have sacrificed his pride, to the extent of doing the work of the Sadducean high-priest, who might have been expected to be equally incensed, in an attempt to exterminate those who had caused a schism in the ranks of the priesthood. Thus he went to that official to request letters of authority to the synagogues at Damascus, in order that he might track down these sectaries, who already defined their doctrines as a "Way."<sup>181</sup>

<sup>178</sup> See appended note

<sup>179</sup> Ac. viii. 1-4.

<sup>180</sup> Gal. i. 13, 14.

<sup>181</sup> Ac. ix. 1, 2. cf. Note 147.

6. Now the Christianity of this priestly faction appears to have been of a vague and indistinct quality. Its members were, indeed, the outermost fringe, who had not in the least grasped the implications of the faith they had adopted; nor did they see why the practice of the new religion should alter, or sever, their adhesion to the Mosaic Law and ritual, which was so dear to their hearts. In fact we may see in them a section of that Judaizing party which Paul found to be so grave a menace to the life of the Church, and which came near to relegating Christianity to the position of a novel Jewish sect. In the very earliest days, even the Apostles failed to realise that any breach of continuity with Judaism was involved in their profession; and we find them not only attending synagogue services, but even the sacrificial worship of the Temple.<sup>182</sup> Moreover, the "*Epistle to the Hebrews*," would have had but little force, unless its readers were still more or less in touch with the ceremonial of sacrifice. In Damascus these sectaries were, possibly, hardly cognisant of the steady development of the Christian consciousness; and just as Paul's conversion aroused their suspicion, so his subsequent conduct earned their undying hatred. Already detesting him as their persecutor, they were suddenly amazed to hear of his change of front. We do not know what lapse of time is implied by,

<sup>182</sup> cf. Ac. ii. 46; iii. 1; v. 12, 20.

"I went away into Arabia; and again I returned unto Damascus;" but it was probably on his return that "straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God," and that "he confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ."<sup>183</sup> It was Paul's Christology, of which we find no trace in this document, though it contains clear evidence of Christian teaching on other matters, which would in the first place have roused the animosity of these Boëthusians; notwithstanding the fact that they proclaimed Jesus the Messiah. But it was when Paul went on to draw the necessary conclusions from his Christological premises, as to the abrogation of the whole of the Mosaic ordinances, that these Judæo-Christians burst into full revolt. In this personal antagonism we may trace the early appearance of Ebionite opinions; and in the history of the Boëthusians we may see another Baptist sect transforming itself into a Christian heresy. There can be little doubt that it is Paul who figures in this document as an incarnation of "*Beliar*," who stalks the land to seduce men from the true faith by his lies, and who eventually brings about the great catastrophe, in which the Temple is destroyed, and the nation finally overthrown.<sup>184</sup>

<sup>183</sup> cf. Gal. i. 17; Ac. ix. 20, 22.

<sup>184</sup> cf. p. 1, l. 14. "There arose the man of scoffing, who taught Israel floods of lies." p. 4, l. 13. "During all these years there will be Belial let loose against

7. It was this catastrophe, the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in the year A.D. 70, and the wide devastation caused by the Roman campaign, which conspired to bring about the great migration of the Boëthusians to Damascus.<sup>185</sup> Feeling that the Temple at Jerusalem had been abolished for ever; and acting upon the precedents set them by their compatriots at Leontopolis and Elephantinê, or even by their Samaritan neighbours at Mount Gerizim; they contemplated the erection of another temple at Damascus, refusing the counsels of despair which characterised the attitude of the Pharisees; in connection with which they reorganised their community, entering upon a New Covenant with

"Israel." p. 20, ll. 13-15. "And from the day when there was gathered in the only teacher," i.e., the crucifixion of Jesus, A.D. 30, "until all the men of the war were wasted," i.e., the destruction of Jerusalem A.D. 70, "who walked with the Man of Lies about forty years." p. 19, ll. 33, 34. "So are all the men who entered into the New Covenant in the land of Damascus, but they turned and committed treason, and turned away from the spring of living waters." Here we have an indication that at some time there was a secession of certain of the Boëthusians to Paul and Christianity.

<sup>185</sup> cf. p. 5, ll. 20, 21. "At the end of the destruction of the land," when "the land became desolate." p. 6, l. 5. "The captivity of Israel who have gone forth out of the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus, all of whom God called princes." p. 4, l. 3. "The priests are the captivity of Israel, who have gone forth out of the land of Judah, and they who have joined them. And the sons of Zadok are the chosen of Israel, men of renown, that arose at the end of the days."

God, and continuing the whole sacrificial system, which their Rabbinical opponents were content to abandon.<sup>186</sup> This body of exiles was led by one who remains nameless, but is designated the "Star;" "The Star is he who explained the Law, who came to Damascus."<sup>187</sup> They called themselves "the sons of Zadok," in a more or less ideal sense, to emphasise their spiritual legitimacy; and they declared that they were the elect "remnant" of the prophetic Scriptures; by which they meant to imply that, not only were they, morally and religiously, the true Israelites, the Church of God; but that their sectarian priesthood was to be, in the future, the only valid priesthood.<sup>188</sup>

8. These Boëthusians acknowledged two Messiahs, in the persons of John Baptist and Jesus; but in both cases the Messiahship was to be realised at some future time. We can readily understand the historical position of the sectaries, who refused to throw over their old Master when they came to adopt a new one. But theologically it is a perplexing position; for while John is nowhere spoken of as the Elijah,

<sup>186</sup> See appended note

<sup>187</sup> cf. p. 7, l. 19. For a curious modern parallel to this, see "*The Times*," 7th May, 1912, 2nd leading article. A Thibetan Buddhist leader at Lhasa, who is known as "The Shining Star, the Defender of Religion."

<sup>188</sup> cf. p. 2. ll. 11, 12. "And among all of them did He raise up for Himself men of renown, in order to leave a remnant to the land, and to fill the face of the world with their offspring."

it cannot be said that the distinction is grounded upon the difference between the Son of David and the Suffering Servant, since neither Messiah appears to fulfil, otherwise than partially, either function. The Baptist is spoken of under the title of "a Root of Planting," which is reminiscent of the Messianic, "a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots;" only, in this case, the Root has been "caused to sprout from Israel and Aaron."<sup>189</sup> This "Root of Planting," who is the Messiah, is destined to appear again;<sup>190</sup> as will also the other Messiah, the "Teacher of Righteousness."<sup>191</sup> The "Root"

<sup>189</sup> cf. p. i. l. 7. "He caused to sprout from Israel and Aaron a Root of Planting." cp. Is. xi. 1.

<sup>190</sup> cf. p. 13, l. 1. "Until there will arise the Anointed from Aaron." p. 19, l. 35; p. 20, l. 1. "From the day when there was gathered in the only Teacher," i.e. the Teacher of Righteousness, "until there will arise the Anointed from Aaron and from Israel."

<sup>191</sup> cf. p. 6. l. 11. "And they shall reach nothing beside them, until there will arise the Teacher of Righteousness in the end of the days." p. 7, l. 20. "The Sceptre," i.e., probably the Teacher, "is the prince of the congregation, and when he will rise, 'he will destroy all the children of Seth'." Probably the Gnostic sect of Sethians is here intended. On this sect see Hippolytus, "*Refut. Hær.*," v. 14-17; x. 7. He gives them an Orphic origin; and in v. 20 he says, *Τουτέστιν ἀποτροπαῖόν τι καὶ φρικτὸν οἱ θεοὶ καθ' Ὁμηρον εἶναι τὸ ὕδωρ νομίζουσιν, ὅπερ ὁ λόγος τῶν Σηθιανῶν φοβερόν εἶναι φησὶ τῷ νοῦ.* Perhaps, with this view of water, they scouted baptism, and were therefore detestable to the Zadokites. See, also, Irenæus, "*Contra Hær.*," i. 30, who makes the Sethites similar to the Ophites. On the latter cf. King, "*The Gnostics and their Remains*," pp. 82-103.



is said to come of the priestly line of Aaron;<sup>192</sup> but nothing is said of the lineage of the "Teacher." But when we notice, running through the document, a strong note of hostility to the house of David, probably inspired by the animosity which is felt for the Pharisees; together with an intense zeal for the priesthood; and when we remember the Sadducean historical associations with a Priest-Kingship, and the tendency in the *pseudepigrapha* to dwell upon the priestly functions of the Messiah; we may take it that the ideal these sectaries had formed of the future, would have been on the lines of a priestly hierarchy, rather than a royal monarchy. The Baptist's work is very accurately described, when it is said that, as a result of his preaching, "they meditated over their sin, and they knew that they were guilty men; and they were like the blind, groping their way for twenty years." And later on we meet with an echo of his work, when we hear of the members of the sect, that "they entered into the covenant of repentance."<sup>193</sup> The former of these two quotations continues, "and God had regard to their works, for they sought Him with a perfect heart. And he raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness." Now this gives us a very important piece of information; for it tells us that John Baptist was at work for a period of no less than twenty years

<sup>192</sup> This agrees with the tradition of Lk. ii. 15; Jn. i. 19, 20, which gives John a priestly origin.

<sup>193</sup> cf. p. i. ll. 8, 9; p. 19, l. 16. Also p. 1, ll. 10, 11.

before the beginning of Jesus' ministry; and thus it strikingly corroborates the conclusions we have already reached upon independent grounds.<sup>194</sup>

<sup>194</sup> cf. *Apost. Const.* ii. 55. Ο γὰρ Θεός, Θεὸς ὧν ἐλέους, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐκάστην γενεὰν ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν καλεῖ διὰ τῶν δικαίων καὶ τῶν προφητῶν· . . . τοὺς πρὸ μικροῦ τῆς ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ τῆς σωματικῆς διὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ προδρόμου· τοὺς δ' αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ μετὰ τὴν γένεσιν αὐτοῦ λέγων Μετανοεῖτε κ.τ.λ. Two interpretations are possible of these words. (i) The bodily appearance may imply the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and Christ's birth the baptism of Jesus. In which case we have a reflection of the Synoptic tradition, which makes the Baptist's work commence only about six months before the ministry of Jesus. (ii) The bodily appearance may stand for the Incarnation (a sense which accords best with the structure of the sentence—"His"=God—and with theological diction); and Christ's birth may mean either the physical fact, or the birth of the Messianic consciousness at the Baptism—a reminiscence of Docetic views. In that case we have a distinct intimation (founded upon tradition, we must suppose), that John was already at work before Jesus' nativity.

## XI

### THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

1. Shortly after the commencement of the Christian era, Palestine was variously divided between three of the sons of the Hasmonæan, Herod the Great.<sup>195</sup> The partition was made by the emperor; and they governed as vassal princes, in allegiance to Rome, who made her authority felt through the person of the *legatus* of Syria. On the death of his father, Archelaüs received the districts of Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa, together with the title of "*ethnarch*." But, after some nine years of wantonly oppressive rule, he was banished to Vienne; and a Roman *procurator*, whose seat of government lay at Cæsarea, was appointed to take over his administrative duties. During Archelaüs' reign, brief though it was, the High-Priesthood had been reduced to the position of a puppet of the Herodian pleasure; and, after his departure, it

<sup>195</sup> A general reference to Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. ii. pp. 1-79, founded upon Josephus, may suffice for this section.

was more or less subordinate to the authority of the *Synedrium*. This *gerousia* of the people was, indeed, possessed of very extensive powers; for it suited the policy of the empire to allow the Jews a large measure of independence in the matter of self-government. But it was the *procurator* who held the powers of life and death, and who was in himself a court of final appeal in all questions of supreme importance. It is probable that, on the whole, the Roman suzerainty was beneficent rather than the reverse; for it curbed the unruly elements, held the balance between factions, introduced a spirit of order, and made a way for material prosperity. Indeed, but for the taxation, and the rapacity with which its incidence was associated, the mild despotism of Rome would have scarcely proved irksome to the subject peoples. The districts of the north-east, which comprised Batanæa, Auranitis, Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, and Panias, were put under the government of Philip, who was dignified by the title of "*tetrarch*." But since the population of those provinces was, in the main, Syrian and Greek, and their religion pagan, they did not fall within the scope of the Baptist's influence; and therefore lie outside our enquiry. The remaining son, Antipas, was created "*tetrarch*" of Galilee and Peræa. His rule appears to have carried with it a larger measure of personal authority than fell to the lot of his brothers. This was partly due, no doubt, to the fact that the power

and prestige of the *Synedrium* scarcely extended within the confines of his territories; but it was also owing to his proved loyalty, which persuaded the emperor that it would be convenient and prudent to leave him very much to himself. And the wisdom of this course seems to have been justified by the results; for he is said to have exercised his authority with considerable talent and discretion. It would be hard to say that the Jews had any political views, as we understand the term, at the period of which we are writing. The Maccabæan revolt had been a stroke for liberty and national independence, and religious motives had then been pushed into the background. But in these later days the religious motives dominated all the symptoms of unrest of which we have any knowledge. The Roman overlordship produced a calm level of social order, only here and there ruffled by some local upheaval, which spoke of volcanic elements kept in abeyance by resolute government. The Baptist's movement was a religious revival of this character; politically dangerous in its inception, but spending its strength, once robbed of that peril, in far-reaching waves of spiritual influence, the length of which were the measure of its primary *momentum*. John's collision with constituted authority probably lay in the one act of fervid zeal, when he attempted to force Jesus' hand, and compel Him to announce Himself the Messiah.

2. In attempting to estimate the moral con-

ditions of Jewish society, in Galilee and Judæa more particularly, in the first century of the Christian era; we are more than ever hampered by the paucity of evidence, and by evidence of the wrong kind. Josephus has left us a political history, which deals with the cruelty and rapacity of rulers, the sorry intrigues of courts, the extortions and corruption of officials; but he does not let us see the life of the mass of the people. The hideous scenes of the last days of Jerusalem, are but part and parcel of the horrors of warfare amongst semi-barbarous peoples, and must be leniently judged, and not taken as an expression of the average Jewish temperament. On the other hand, the strictures of Jesus, and the grave indictments of early Christian writers, must not be made to form a basis for wide generalisations<sup>196</sup>. Moralists habitually take a one-sided view; or rather, they present only one particular feature in a landscape, relying upon the knowledge of their audience to redress the balance, to reduce objects to their right perspective, and to fill in the blank spaces. Therefore it is that an attempted reconstruction, at the present day, must necessarily be largely conjectural. It need hardly be said that such a reconstruction will not be volunteered here. We are only concerned to notice, in brief, some of the factors

<sup>196</sup> cf. Montefiore, "*Hibbert Lectures*," Lecture ix. and his more recent books, which show that, e.g. the typical Pharisee should be rescued from the odium which has befallen him, and rehabilitated in our esteem.

which would contribute to that end. In the first place there is the question of population. That this was very mixed in character is what, by modern analogies and ancient testimonies, we should expect of a Mediterranean littoral. The narrow, tortuous streets of the larger towns would have been crowded with representatives of many nationalities; merchants and mechanics, soldiers, slaves and officials. The villages, indeed, would have proved exclusive to alien settlement; but on the hill-sides, or by the caravan routes, the nomadic encampments of Bedouin or Syrian shepherds would have been a familiar sight. But a clear line of demarcation would have been observable, between the main centres of Jewish life and influence on the one hand, and the towns of Herodian foundation, which boasted their Hellenic culture, on the other.<sup>197</sup> The difference between Jerusalem and Cæsarea Philippi,\* or Judæa and Galilee, was very considerable. In the one, the haughty exclusiveness and rigidity, the proud independence and religious fervour, of an ancient and peculiar people settled in its native fastness; in the other, the foreign influences, the gay life, the buildings of barbaric splendour, and the cosmopolitan temper which had rid itself of the fetters of traditionalism. The one, narrow and unprogressive; the other, in the eye of the world.

<sup>197</sup> cf. G. A. Smith, "*Hist. Geog.*" p. 139. "Was Joppa Jewish, national, patriotic, Cæsarea was Herodian, Roman in obedience, Greek in culture."

3. It is a curious fact that the distinctive Jewish characteristics, the national spirit and aspirations, should have held out so long and so persistently against the influx of external forces, cultural, religious and social, in the very confined territory of Judæa. Its geographical situation on its barren high-lands, the wild and desert or unproductive nature of its soil, and the absence of any important road-ways, may have conspired to this end. But no doubt the strength of Judaism lay in the wide dispersion of its adherents, whose interest and hopes were centred in the Holy City. The large Jewish populations gathered in the great cities of the empire, the undoubted economic and commercial power they wielded, and the jealous guardianship which they exhibited for their religious traditions and privileges, would have acted as a restraint upon foreign interference, and as a source of encouragement to their brethren in their native land.<sup>198</sup> We gather that class distinctions were well marked; though it is not easy to see how those distinctions fell. The Sadducean party comprised an old landed aristocracy, and the higher ranks of the priesthood, who were also, in all probability, large landowners. Side by side with them stood an aristocracy of learning and authority, the Scribes, whose power in the state and influence over the people was very extensive. Then, again, there would have been

<sup>198</sup> cf. Mommsen, "*History of Rome*," vol. v. p. 417.



a wealthy commercial class, mainly of the Pharisaic party; merchants whose prosperity was often founded in the over-sea carrying trade, perhaps the principal source of great wealth in that day. But what relations of a social kind existed between these various members of an upper class, it is impossible to say. The lower ranks of the professional classes, priests and scribes, a large official body mainly foreign, and the smaller merchants, would have formed a middle class; and below them again, there were those engaged in agricultural and mechanical pursuits, peasants and artisans, together with the collectors of taxes, and slaves. The mechanical arts were, doubtless, those familiar in Palestine of to-day; and we do not hear of any special industry. Nor do we meet with any reference to the operations of mining. The existence of slavery amongst the Jews is probable, since the whole ancient world, with the varied fabrics of its civilisations, was based upon that institution;<sup>199</sup> and it seems to be proved by the fact that the Essenes repudiated the custom.<sup>200</sup> The main occupations of the people, as in earlier days, were provided by the land; they were pastoral and agricultural. We know that sheep and cattle were bred; and we have

<sup>199</sup> cf. Patterson, "*The Nemesis of Nations*," which gives a full account of the institution of slavery, and of how it spelt the ruin of one ancient civilisation after another.

<sup>200</sup> cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.*, II. ii. p. 198.

ample evidence of the cultivation of wheat, of the olive, and the vine. But we are ignorant of the system of land-tenure which obtained; for the Deuteronomic legislation, in this, as in other respects, had broken down, even if it ever did reflect actual custom, and not an ideal condition of things. There was probably a class of peasant proprietors, who passed on their holdings by a law of inheritance; but certainly the larger landowners, whose wealth may often have been derived from other sources, exhibited a tendency, as in the days of Isaiah, to absorb their struggling neighbours. Great contrasts of wealth and poverty were a feature of a social life, which had in it the seeds of its own disruption; and the latter we may trace to its obvious sources, in the taxation, which was inevitably shifted to the weakest shoulders, the oppressive abuse of power by the great, and the debtor's laws, which were harsh in the extreme.

4. The education of the people, which was placed upon a religious foundation, was well cared for. The synagogue system undoubtedly meant a certain measure of intellectual enlightenment, together with an awakening of religious interests. The schools sharpened the wits of the young, if they did not impart any very useful knowledge; and they brought the sanctions of religion into touch with the home life. But, unhappily, the *pabulum* supplied, and the general conception of what constitutes a proper intellectual equipment, so far from

nourishing, rather tended to the weakening of the moral fibre. Exercises in rabbinical tradition, the guidance of the life by minute ordinances governing the most trivial details, the observance of customs which had assumed the sanctity of a mystic cult; all these things left no room for the expansion of conscience, and the development of character; and they crushed those human instincts which are the material of which true nobility and social harmony must be constructed. An extreme form of legalism must necessarily have encouraged the growth of the most unamiable qualities; of selfishness, arrogance, and an acute lack of all sympathy. Conscience, having compounded with authority, and having abdicated its own right to govern, would easily have found the means to evade the intolerable pressure of moral duties; righteousness was 'not' held to imply piety, and ethical conduct was divorced from religious motives and standards. Thus an immense scope was left for the growth of vicious tendencies; and the laxity of the professors of the Law, would have been reflected on a gigantic scale in the lives of those, to whom they were the highest examples of right living and right thinking. Greed and oppression, vindictiveness and deceit, sexual immorality and callous indifference to the sufferings of the poor, the outcasts, and the sick; all these doubtless thrived in such an environment. But it is fatally easy to fill in these dark patches; and it may be

well to remember that Judæa in the first century of our era was, in many respects, purer and sweeter than in the pre-exilic days; and Jerusalem, by contrast with Rome, was still a City of Holiness. Nevertheless, there was ample scope for a prophet of John's calibre. No doubt, with his talk of the impending judgment and the dissolution of the world, his appeal was rather to personal fears, than to any higher motives. But it says something for his contemporaries that his mission was attended with so great success, and that his memory was cherished for long after his death. They were not wholly bad if they could be awakened to a real repentance, which meant not merely an avowal of sin, but that they were content to accept a course of discipline, and laboured to exhibit that change of character which was the practical issue of John's teaching. And there can be little question that the Baptist's movement produced a strong moral revulsion; though, as was the case with Jesus, his converts were drawn mainly from the poorer classes, the uneducated and the depraved, and scarcely at all from those aristocracies of birth and privilege, wealth and learning, who evidently did not relish the directness of his speech.

5. Religious feelings in Palestine ran high. The antagonisms born of opposite opinions, the incompatibility of aims which would not be neutralised, the bitterness generated by partisan *shibboleths*; these, and not political aspirations,

were the disintegrating elements at work in those narrow territories. The decline and fall of Judaism is a history of sectarian divisions. During the period of the Baptist's ministry these forces were to some extent pent up, and only occasionally made their presence acutely felt. But all the while, beneath the surface, and unknown to the principal actors, they were busily fomenting a great revolutionary movement, which was ultimately to lead to national ruin and extinction. To grasp what was John's place in the weltering tide of his religious environment, it will be necessary to glance at the various parties into which the nation was then split up.

6. And we may, in the first place, turn to the so-called Herodian party, the retainers and sycophants of the Hasmonæan house.<sup>201</sup> In the Herods, whose cause they espoused, we have the degenerate successors of the Maccabees. The political creed of the Maccabees had been a patriotic belief in the possibility of a complete independence from foreign rule, and a national integrity; but these ideas their successors had forsworn. They had no objection to the Roman over-lordship; but their one desire was to win back to Herodian government, probably by peaceable means, the provinces of Judæa, Samaria and Idumæa, which had been forfeited by Aristobulus to a Roman *procurator*. They longed to permeate Jewish life with Hellenic culture, and so to bring their nationality into

<sup>201</sup> cf. *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii. col. 2043.

line with the progressive spirit of the times. And they bitterly opposed the Messianic idea, which they regarded as retrograde and stultifying to that forward policy. Thus their attitude was one of waiting upon events, in order to serve their own private interests. Their religious conceptions were Sadducean, in so far as that implied a kind of worldly scepticism, or a negation of the more spiritual ideas of other religious parties. But it would not be true to say that the Sadducees had any political sympathies with the Herodians, or, indeed, any closer bond of connection with them than a similar detestation of idealistic opinions, and a certain measure of the same aristocratic prejudices.

7. The Sadducees are the next party to claim our notice; though, indeed, "party" is scarcely a fitting term to apply to an unorganised class representing a particular mentality. Their name may possibly be derived from that of Zadok the priest, to whose "sons" the offices of the priesthood were mainly entrusted from the time of the return from exile. On the other hand, the Sadducean party and the priesthood were not commensurate; all the Sadducees were not priests, nor were all the priests Sadducees. Therefore there is more probability in the view which would give them a sectarian origin, from one Zadok, a disciple of Antigonus of Soko, and a fellow-disciple of Boëthus.<sup>202</sup> The Sadducees appear to have been a wealthy and

<sup>202</sup> See appended note

aristocratic party. Though in pre-Maccabæan, as well as in later times, they numbered a section of the priesthood in their ranks, it must not be supposed that at any time they were identical with the priestly caste. In the first place, there was undoubtedly a clear-cut division in the ranks of the priesthood; and it was, in all probability, only, or mainly, the higher ranks, themselves forming an aristocracy of wealth and political influence, who consorted, by a sort of natufal affinity, or for reasons of political and religious conservatism and orthodoxy, with the landed aristocracy which was not of the priesthood. And, in the second place, it is certain that many priests were of the Pharisaic party, the new orthodoxy, and accepted the doctrines of the scribes, and perhaps imbued themselves with the teachings of the apocalyptists. Now the higher orders of the priesthood were undoubtedly supported by Johannes<sup>e</sup> Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannæus, precisely because of their Sadducean opinions; and, equally certainly, it was the Sadducean character of the priesthood, dispossessed by the first Maccabees, which aroused the opposition and hatred of those patriots. The early Sadducees seem to have displayed exactly those qualities which emerged in the later Hasmonæans. They coquetted with foreign culture, the Hellenism of the Seleucid period, and went far to render effective the policy of Antiochus Epiphanes, which aimed at nothing short of the obliteration of the Jewish polity and religion.

Their influence in this direction was once for all curtailed, when the queen, Salome Alexandra, definitely espoused the cause of the Pharisees. In latter days they were a small and exclusive body, wielding very little political power, and being altogether outnumbered by the Pharisees in the *Synedrium*. Their religious opinions, in these times, were of so negative a quality, as to lay them open to the charge of being sceptics, if not infidels. As a matter of fact, their worldliness and materialism caused them to be intensely conservative in their tenets; and they claimed, with some justification, that their conservatism was the true orthodoxy. They accepted the *Torah*, which perhaps implied little more than the Pentateuch,<sup>203</sup> as the bed-rock of their religious ideas; and they bitterly opposed the doctrinal and legal developments, which the Pharisees laboriously evolved from the rabbinical comments upon the Law. Thus they were led to deny the resurrection of the body, and even the immortality of the soul; on the ground that these doctrines had no warrant in the *Torah*. They refused to accept the Angelology and Dæmonology of the Pharisees, upon precisely the same grounds. And whereas the Pharisees were (to use more recent terms, which must not be too rigorously applied) Predestina-

<sup>203</sup> The "*Zadokite document*" uses the Prophets as authoritative; but then it also appeals to pseudepigraphic literature; both of which mark a great advance upon the Sadducean position.



rians, the Sadducees insisted upon the rights of Free Will. And it must be allowed that, in strictness, the Old Testament gives its support to the negative attitude of those who denied the validity of the whole theory of development. It will at once be recognised, that the rejection of the immortality of the soul necessarily put them into a position of antagonism towards that Messianic eschatology, with which the mass of the people was indoctrinated. Hence, one of the reasons for the unpopularity of the Sadducean party.<sup>204</sup>

8. A discussion of the tenets of Sadduceism has naturally led us to contrast that party, in certain respects, with the Pharisees, to whom we must now turn. Their designation meant "The Separated"; and it precisely defined their religious attitude in the Jewish state. But it is quite unknown when, or from whom, they first got their name.<sup>205</sup> If the Sadducees were associated by circumstances with the priesthood, then the Pharisees were far more closely identified with the Scribes. But here, again, we must not imagine that the two bodies were in any sense the same. The Scribes were a profession rather than a party. They were the trained lawyers, whose business it was to interpret the *Torah*,

<sup>204</sup> See appended note

<sup>205</sup> פְּרִישִׁים *Φαρισαῖοι*, are first mentioned in the days of Hyrcanus. cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 10, 5. On the Pharisees, cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.* II. ii. pp. 10-28. *Ency. Bib.* vol. iv. cols. 4321-4329.

and codify the utterances of the Jewish Fathers which were based upon it. This work was naturally academic in character ; and we find that they were, controversially, divided into several schools of interpretation, of which the most important were those of Shammai and Hillel. These schools were destined to play a notorious part, after the destruction of Jerusalem, in the formation of the principal churches of the future Judaism. The Scribes were also educationists, holding it to be their business to instruct the youth of Israel. And, in addition, by the very force of circumstances, they were judges ; administering the Law which they themselves built up.<sup>206</sup> Now, undoubtedly, some of the Pharisees were Scribes, in this professional meaning of the term ; while, conversely, very large numbers of the Scribes were of the Pharisaic party. This was only in the natural order of things ; for we must remember that the whole business of Pharisaism was to give actuality to the legalistic structure erected by Scribal labour. But we know that certain of the Scribes belonged to the Sadducean party, being, perhaps, somewhat narrower in their sympathies than their Pharisaic brethren. The reverence which the Pharisees accorded to the *Torah*, and the oral expansion and modification of it which it was their peculiar responsibility to enhance, goes back to the days

<sup>206</sup> For the Scribes, cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.* II. i. pp. 306-379.

of Ezra the Scribe, and to the activities of the Deuteronomic School. In point of fact, though they may have sentimentally regarded themselves as the prophetic "remnant," and though their theory of development may have carried them very far afield from their parent source; from an intellectual point of view Ezra is their true progenitor.

9. The Pharisees first came upon the stage of history, as a distinct party or school,<sup>207</sup> during the course of the Maccabean rebellion; but it was under another name. There can be little doubt that the Assidæans, or "the Pious," were the older representatives of the later Pharisees; and we find them, on their first appearance, already an organised body.<sup>208</sup> Though the Assidæans took their due part in political affairs, it is clear that their chief care was the very reverse of political. As was the case with their successors, the Pharisees, their aims were wholly religious.<sup>209</sup> Thus they could find it in their

<sup>207</sup> The word *αἱρεσις* was not applied to them, the Orthodox *par excellence*, in any invidious sense, until uninstructed Christian writers confounded their position with that of the Christian heretics.

<sup>208</sup> אֲסִידָאִים 'Ασιδαῖοι. cf. 1 Macc. ii. 42, where, with Swete, read συναγωγὴν Ἀσιδαίων, not Ἰουδαίων.

<sup>209</sup> cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. i. pp. 211, 212 (note). Kennett, "*The Servant of the Lord*," *passim*. Probably the Assidæans are those addressed in Ps. xxx. 4, 5; xxxi. 24; xxxvii. 28; and we may find a reference to them in *Bērāchōth*, v. i. "The pious of ancient days used to pause one hour before they began to pray, that they might direct their hearts to God."

to throw in their lot with the Maccabees, when it seemed to them that the struggle was one for religious liberty, as against the insolent attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes utterly to decimate Judaism. But when the Maccabean revolt appeared to have achieved its object, and the acuteness of the religious question was allayed; and when the movement thereupon began to assume a temporal and political character of its own; then it behoved the Assidæans to forsake their sometime companions in arms, and betake them once more to their religious duties.<sup>210</sup> It cannot be said that there ever was any considerable sympathy, on the part of the Pharisees, for the Hasmonæan rulers. For the Pharisaic ideal of a theocratically-governed state, with an Aaronic priesthood, also included the restoration of the Davidic dynasty; and, to them, the Hasmonæans must always have appeared in the light of usurpers. Even the prudential sympathy and patronage of Alexandra did not reconcile them to the reigning house; though it was owing to this that the Pharisees first grew to a position of power and influence; an ascendancy which they maintained up to, and beyond, the destruction of Jerusalem and the final dispersion of the nation. They were not, in strictness, even a popular party; but, being antipathetic to the Herodians and Sadducees, and standing always for the principle of religious liberty, they

<sup>210</sup> cf. 1 Macc. ii. 42; vii. 13. Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 10, 2.

were found to be, by an inevitable coincidence, the exponents of the people's cause.

10. It may be said that, in the first century of our era, it is possible to distinguish a three-fold division in the ranks of the Pharisees; a right and a left wing, and a centre.<sup>211</sup> The centre had ceased to "care for the nation as a political entity, and preferred to regard it only in its religious aspect, as a Church."<sup>212</sup> They had parted company with the ideal of a theocratic state of present establishment, and waited in patience for the divine inauguration, in the future, of a Messianic Kingdom, which alone could be expected to right the hopeless entanglements of the present situation. Now this Messianic Kingdom was, in their view, to be strictly a temporal Kingdom, governed by a monarch of the Davidic line.<sup>213</sup> The "*Psalms of Solomon*,"

<sup>211</sup> This must not be taken too literally; for instance, the Zealots were not necessarily all of them Pharisees; it is rather a convenient grouping according to tendencies. It is impossible to gauge the ramifications of the various parties, or to judge whether there were classes who stood entirely outside all party organisations and influences. But, on the analogy of our English political parties, it is probable that a rough division ran right through the people, educated and uneducated alike.

<sup>212</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 8, 3, gives an account of the answer which certain Jews, who were clearly Pharisees, returned to Petronius at Ptolemais: οἱ δὲ, οὐδαμῶς πολεμήσομεν, ἔφασαν, τεθνηξόμεθα δὲ πρότερον ἢ παραβῆναι τοὺς νόμους.

<sup>213</sup> cf. "*Book of Jubilees*," xxxi. 18-20. "And to Judah he said . . . A prince shalt thou be, thou and one of thy sons, over the sons of Jacob . . . In

and the "*Book of Jubilees*," which are both of Pharisaic authorship of this central type, are quite innocent of all apocalyptic tendencies. The rejection of Jesus by the Pharisees was precisely based upon the eschatological elements in His teaching, which were disagreeable to them.<sup>214</sup> Their sole care, in the immediate present, was for the Law, which they sought to apply, with the aid of oral tradition, to all the affairs and departments of life. The theory of development which they promulgated was essentially vital and progressive; but in practice it assumed a hard legalistic quality, in which equity was stultified by precedent. Their abhorrence of foreign culture, and their studious avoidance of all that was un-Jewish, was, as a matter of fact, pursued in ignorance of the historical truth that many of their speculative tenets were derived from foreign sources, in particular from Greek and Zoroastrian. It was this inequitable legalistic spirit which, while it was the dominant note of official righteousness, earned for them the well-merited epithet of "hypocrites." Having succeeded in capturing the best intelligence, and

thee shall be the help of Jacob, and in thee be found the salvation of Israel. And when thou sittest on the throne of the honour of thy righteousness, there will be great peace for all the seed of the sons of the beloved."

<sup>214</sup> See the Pharisaic attitude of one of that body, who was patient of instruction; Nicodemus; Jn. iii. 1-15; especially the question and answer, "How can these things be?" "Art thou the teacher of Israel, and understandest not these things?"

the highest character, of the nation; and while they wielded a power which no other party could claim to possess; they came, in course of time, to form a religious aristocracy, exclusive in its social organisation, and somewhat esoteric in its doctrines. It was this Pharisaic centre which gradually formed itself into the Rabbinical schools of later Judaism, which, in their day, were responsible for the production of the dreary wastes of *Talmud* and *Midrashim*.

11. The Pharisaic right wing may be found in the faction, which afterwards attained such unenviable notoriety under the name of the "Zealots."<sup>215</sup> The party seems to have been founded by one Judas, son of Hezekiah, of Gamala in Gaulonitis; who, in company with a Pharisee named Sadduc, raised a rebellion to resist the census imposed, with a view to taxation, by Quirinius.<sup>216</sup> Josephus says that this

<sup>215</sup> The name *Ζηλωταί*, Lk. vi. 15; Ac. i. 13, is equivalent to *Kanaiaîos*—not *Kanavítēs*—Mt. x. 4; Mk. iii. 18; which = נְזִינְיָ from נָזַר Simon the Apostle was a Zealot. On the Zealots, cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. ii. pp. 80; 177, 178; 227-230. The Sicarii were probably an extreme section of the Zealots.

<sup>216</sup> For this Judas, cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. ii. pp. 4, 80, 123, 131. Gamaliel refers to him in his speech before the *Synedrium*; Ac. v. 37. cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 5, 2; *B.J.* ii. 8, 1; 17, 8; vii. 8, 1. Josephus' account of Theudas, *Ant.* xx. 5. 1; cf. Ac. v. 36, suggests that this man may have claimed to be the Messiah, marching to the possession of his Kingdom, and, like Joshua of old, hoping to make a miraculous crossing of the Jordan. On the conflict between Luke and Josephus over these men, cf. Schmiedel in *Ency. Bib.* vol. iv. cols. 5049-5056.

party represented "a fourth philosophic sect" amongst the Jews; and that they were in agreement with the Pharisees upon all points, save only that they refused to acknowledge any but God as their King, and that they regarded agitation and forcible measures in the cause of liberty as a most sacred duty.<sup>217</sup> Their single-minded hatred of the Roman suzerainty, and absolute devotion to the idea of a theocratically governed Messianic Kingdom, strangled in them every vestige of political sagacity, and drove them to press fanatically for revolution at all costs, with the hope that the keen edge of the sword would win them their ideals.

12. For the left wing of the Pharisaic party we have to look to the humbler and poorer representatives of a real religious feeling amongst the populace. They were probably organised in various sectarian societies, nameless and to us unknown, but whose influence was not proportionate to their insignificance in the public eye. While the main body of the Pharisees had made a new departure in the fields of Rabbinism, these were the spiritual progeny of the Assidæans of old, who had indeed suffered for their right-

<sup>217</sup> cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 1, 1 and 6. We may quote the latter passage. Τῇ δὲ τετάρτῃ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν ὁ Γαλιλαῖος Ἰούδας ἡγεμὼν κατέστη, τὰ μὲν λοιπὰ πάντα γνώμῃ τῶν Φαρισαίων ὁμολογοῦσι, δυσκίνητος δὲ τοῦ ἐλευθέρου ἔρως ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς, μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην τὸν Θεὸν ὑπειληφῶσι. Θανάτων τε ἰδέας ὑπομένειν παρηλλαχμένους ἐν ὀλίγῳ τίθενται, καὶ συγγενῶν τιμωρίας καὶ φίλων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδένα ἀνθρώπον προσαγορεύειν δεσπότην.



eousness, and who, in the worst days of the Seleucid and Hasmonæan periods, had kept alight the torch of a living faith. It was amongst these anonymous folk that there was produced that strange apocalyptic literature, with which the early Christian Church felt so marked a sympathy, and in which its leaders found so fruitful a source of inspiration.<sup>218</sup> That literature as a whole breathes a spirit of other-worldliness. It is assured of a Messianic Kingdom; but the Kingdom to which it looks forward is in no sense a temporal one. It is, rather, conceived on wholly spiritual and moral lines; which is to say that its outlook is essentially eschatological. Thus it is pervaded by a great calm; for its authors are quite content with the sufferings and disillusionments of the present age, in view of the glories which will hereafter be revealed. They bow to God's over-ruling providence, and suffer a Gentile supremacy in silence. It was probably from this section of the Pharisees that the great mass of converts was made in the first days of Christianity;<sup>219</sup> it may be that to them are to be ascribed such names as Simeon, Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea;<sup>220</sup> and it was

<sup>218</sup> cf. Sanday in Hastings' *Dict. Bib.* vol. ii. p. 608. And see, in part, Box, in "*Journ. Theol. Studies*," vol. xiii. pp. 321-338.

<sup>219</sup> cf. Ac. ii. 5, 37, 41; vi. 7<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>220</sup> cf. Lk. ii. 25. Simeon was "righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel." For Nicodemus, Jn. iii. 1ff; xix. 39. Joseph of Arimathea "was looking for the Kingdom of God," Mk. xv. 43.

into such devout circles, and apocalyptic influences, that Jesus Himself was born.<sup>221</sup>

13. But we have yet to notice one other Jewish "sect" (if we are to make use of Josephus' inaccurate expression); namely, the Essenes.<sup>222</sup> These people lay quite in the background of Jewish life; they came into conflict with no political or religious party; and they were regarded with respect by officials and people alike. It is especially interesting to notice the sympathy which Josephus the Pharisee entertained towards them; for he treats of them at far greater length than any other religious party. They are, in truth, only important for our purposes, as exhibiting what the Jewish genius and temperament were capable of producing. It is possible to describe them as a monastic brotherhood, or a *congeries* of such brotherhoods; who were akin to the Pharisees in that they tried to give a practical realisation to the Law; but unlike them in the extraordinarily austere asceti-

"A good man and a righteous," Lk. xxiii. 50, 51. cp. Mt. xxvii. 57; Jn. xix. 38. Perhaps also Joseph, Mt. i. 19; Zacharias and Elizabeth, Lk. i. 6; Mary, Lk. i. 28, 30; Anna, Lk. ~~N.~~ 37; and Barnabas, Ac. xi. 24.

<sup>221</sup> Jesus' Apocalyptic teaching, His appeal to the poor and humble, His opposition to the Pharisaic legalists, and the thought of the Canticles in the Nativity chapters of Luke (which may have originated in these circles), all point in the same direction.

<sup>222</sup> For the Essenes, cf. Lightfoot's essay in his "*Colossians and Philemon*;" Schürer, *H.J.P.* II. ii. pp. 188-218; Jülicher in *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii. cols. 1396-1400. Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 5,9; xviii. 1, 5; *B.J.* ii. 8, 2-13.

cism of their lives. There are certain conceptions embodied in the practices of the Essenes which argue an influence upon them from without, partly Zoroastrian and partly neo-Pythagorean. Their chief care was the attainment of self-perfection and future bliss, which they sought to arrive at through the discipline of a rigidly organised communal life. But above this there was, as the motive-force or inspiration of their movement, the two-fold attempt to actualise, and give tangible form to, the love of God and the love of their fellow-men. This brought them nearest to the genius of Christianity, and accounted for their rapid disappearance when the message of the Gospel became known. The greater light absorbed the lesser. Attempts have been made, from time to time, but with a conspicuous lack of success, to prove that Jesus and John Baptist both owed their particular teachings to Essene antecedents. It may confidently be affirmed that, not only do neither betray any leaning whatsoever to the special characteristics of this body; but, further, that the antagonism exhibited towards both by the official leaders of the people, with whom the Essenes preserved an unfailing popularity, is a marked disproof of the existence of any such affinity. At the most, in the case of John Baptist, it is a possibility that the Hemerobaptists, to whom his disciples became assimilated at a comparatively late date, may have had some early connection with the Essenes.

14. It remains now to see whether we can trace any clear affinities, or antipathies, between the Baptist and the various parties we have been considering; for it is not to be supposed that John was an exception to the general rule, that a man must have his spiritual and intellectual, as well as his physical, antecedents and relationships. Of his indebtedness to ancestral or contemporary thought, however, it is impossible to assert anything, so utterly insufficient are the accounts of his teaching which we possess. But we can, to a limited extent, define his relation to the main currents of opinion we have examined. Thus, in the first place, John's prediction of the Messiah would have definitely estranged him from the Herodians, on political, and from the Sadducees, on religious grounds. His very pronounced revolt against the spirit of formalism; his insistence upon a righteousness to which he gave a moral, and not a legal, content; his imprecation of impending judgment, which was to find out the children of Abraham before all the rest of the world; and the caustic phrases in which he summed up his hearers' infirmities of character: all these would have shaken woefully the complacency of the Pharisees in particular, and embittered their opinion of him. Still more would the Pharisees have been alienated by John's avoidance of the Temple and Synagogue worship, and his practical rejection, like his great prophetic predecessors, Amos and Jeremiah, of the Priesthood and Sacrifice; though in this he

would, in some measure, have had the countenance of the Essenes. But, in the next place, while the Baptist's doctrine of a temporal Messianic Kingdom would have won the approval of the Pharisaic centre, and more especially of the Zealot right wing; his conservatism, which was due perhaps to his priestly and possibly Sadducean origin, with regard to the *Torah* and the Prophetic teaching, and his rejection of scribal tradition, would, to that extent, have endeared him to the Sadducees. But, so far as the evidence of his teaching and actions takes us, we cannot detect in John any sort of sympathy with the apocalyptic schools of thought; and it was for that reason, so it appears, that he was so little able to appreciate the position and mission of Jesus. In brief, though we may discern many points of similarity and of contrast, it remains that John Baptist stands out a distinct personality against his historical background; a man very largely independent of his surroundings, and belonging rather to the pre-exilic past than to his own period. And it is that fact which gives him his unique importance in the religious development of his people; for in his own person he linked up the old and the new, he unified certain diverse elements in both phases, and he fittingly rounded off the progressive history of the past, bringing it to a point where it culminated in the revelation shortly to be made by Jesus. This relation of the Baptist to the great prophetic period of the past is emphasised partly

by his adoption of a Nazarite mode of life,<sup>223</sup> and partly by his reiteration of the moral call to repentance.<sup>224</sup> His voice, as it were, rings from the graves of the mighty dead, and makes its final appeal to the living conscience of the nation.

<sup>223</sup> See appended note

<sup>224</sup> cf. Is. i. 16, 17; lv. 7; Jer. vii. 3-7; Ez. xviii. 19-32; xxxvi. 25-27; Joel ii. 12, 13; Micah vi. 8; Zech. i. 3, 4.

## XII

### THE LIFE OF JOHN BAPTIST

1. It was upon a world seething with restive discontent, and inspired by hopelessly incompatible hopes and ideals, that there burst, quite suddenly, the strange and arresting figure of John, who was afterwards known as the Baptist. It was rumoured that he was sprung of a priestly family; but all that men knew certainly about him was that for many years past, and probably from his childhood, he had lived a solitary, secluded life, far away from the haunts of men, and quite out of touch with the political, social and religious life of his times and people. He was a man who owned no allegiance to any sect or party; but in secret he practised the severest austerities, with a view to making his own peace with God. But one day a report began to circulate that a prophet had appeared; and persons of all classes became anxious to know whether, of a truth, they had lived to see a phenomenon which had now been unfamiliar to Israel for many

generations. It was said that John, coming out from his remote desert habitation, had begun to flit about the outskirts of the villages and country towns of Judæa, where his wild figure, grotesque clothing, and fiery language, arrested and riveted the attention of passers by. The *marabout* had become vocal, under pressure of a divine *afflatus*. He moved about with great rapidity and ~~serious~~ secrecy; he was here to-day, and gone to-morrow; and ever and again he would retreat to his desert solitudes. Curiosity excited, it was there that people sought him, to confirm the impressions that had reached them through various sources of information; and there they lighted upon him, and listened to his impassioned discourse. He announced that the Word of God had come to him, as it had done in times past to the great prophets of Israel; driving him out into the world with a message to deliver to his generation. And this message was one of terrific import; for it was no less than that the Great Day of the Lord was imminent, and might dawn immediately. In view of that impending catastrophe, he exhorted all, in ringing tones and with an awful intensity of fervour, to repent and be reconciled with their God before the doom should fall. His words had an instant and tremendous effect. He wielded a terror to which a corrupt and effete society easily falls a victim. Men had deemed that the age of prophecy was past and dead; but here they beheld before their eyes an undoubted living representa-



tive of that old school. They had put from them the very thought of a period of judgment and vengeance from the Almighty, and had sunk into the dreamless slumber of a moral paralysis; but now their satisfaction was rudely shaken, and horrible doubts were made to assail their minds. Rich and poor, uneducated and cultured, even the haughty members of a religious aristocracy, flocked trembling to hear the tremendous words of denunciation fall from John's lips. He poured a withering contempt upon their formalism, he attacked in scathing terms their unprincipled lives; but he gave them hope of a reformation of character, and assisted them with advice in the scruples of their conscience. And so his fame spread far and wide; he ever enlarged the sphere of his influence, as the attractive power which was in him developed; and, though he probably knew the rebuffs of adversity, on the whole his popularity never waned. He became a settled feature in the religious life of his people, as, year after year, he spoke of the wrath to come; and, like Isaiah of old, awaited the accomplishment of his prophecy.

2. And at length there came a change. We know not by what psychological processes the intuition was borne in upon his mind; but at last it seemed to him that the hour of destiny had struck. The Day of Wrath was at hand; but it would be revealed in the person of the Messiah. The Anointed of God would shortly appear, to gather up His elect ones into His Kingdom; He

would seize the throne of David from the impotent hands of the usurping Herodian line; He would destroy the power of Rome, and set His seat at Jerusalem; and then He would avenge Himself on His enemies, and in one grand cataclysm Gentile and renegade Jew would at once be swept from His sight. John's way was clear to him. Hitherto he had merely announced the coming judgment; but now his message was developed to a two-fold issue. First, he must proclaim the advent of Messiah; and next he must prepare His way for Him, by making clear who were His elect at His coming. In order to do this, he bethought him of the rite of baptism, as a seal to be set upon those who had responded to his preaching of repentance. For would not Messiah Himself initiate His elect to His Kingdom by a baptism of the Spirit? So he left behind him the Judæan wilderness, and, reaching the river Jordan, he crossed to Beth Nimrah, where he found water in sufficient quantity. On his way he collected to him whom he could, and led them with him in a body. Arrived at his destination, he called upon those sinners, who had given proof of their penitence, to seal their confession and shame of sin by the ordinance of baptism. So, he declared, would they be known as God's righteous ones at the coming of Messiah, and be received into His Kingdom; and so would they escape the Day of Doom, and not fall before His wrath. This movement brought John still more prominently before the

public eye. Then it was that men began to question themselves as to who this prophet might be, who had set himself so notable a task. Was it possible that the mantle and spirit of one of Israel's great ones had fallen upon him; and that in him an Isaiah or a Jeremiah had, 'as it were, come to life again? But, when questioned on the subject, John's consciousness of his mission responded to neither of these hypothetical suggestions. He could only speak of himself as the herald, sent by God, to prepare the way of Messiah, and so to open the doors of judgment; "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, 'Make ye ready the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.'"

3. But, while John was thus declaring the close proximity of the Day of the Lord, to be ushered in by the conquests of Messiah, there was One, in far-away Nazareth, who had been spending the early years of His life in the seclusion of a humble trade. The reports which reached Him of this strange Prophet aroused, first, His interest and then His enthusiasm. It was the actual result of the work which John was achieving that first made known to Jesus the fact that His own hour was come, and the period of His ministry had dawned. Fired by the knowledge that He also had a message to deliver, He felt that He must first join hands with the great moralist, the dealer in religious invective, who had so wonderfully opened for Him the door to His new life. It seemed to Him entirely appro-

priate, since His declaration of God's mind would begin where John's left off, that He should submit Himself to the baptism, which would be a seal of the righteousness which was in Him. He journeyed southwards, and approached the scene of John's activities one evening, when all the people had gone. And so Jesus and the Baptist met, solitary by the water-side, as the darkness drew on. The meeting was the immediate cause of a strange current of sympathy which passed from the one to the other; but it was far more. By a true, but incalculable, intuitive judgment, John was able to perceive that he stood in the presence of One who was quite unlike the crowds he had been busily baptising for a long while past, and who was infinitely greater than himself. There flashed across his mind the perception that this was the culminating moment, and the whole secret, of his ministry. It suddenly became clear to him that he had been sent, not merely to foretell the Messiah, but to discover Him. Making the great venture of faith, he stood convinced that this was the Messiah, in whose presence he stood. Realising to the full that his whole ministry had been preparatory to the work of this Great One, he was now ready to lay down his office at the other's behest. With awe he did Jesus' bidding; and the act of baptism, fraught with a new significance, appeared to confirm in his mind the impression he had received. And on Jesus' side, it is legitimate to conjecture that this recog-

niton by John was the potent cause of His own subsequent consciousness of His Messiahship; and that it was that dawning consciousness which drove Him into the desert, that there, by wrestling in prayer with God, He might clarify His thought.

4. The meeting of the two, though fraught with such infinite consequences, was brief. And when, in the darkness, they parted, it was never to meet again in this life. But each had received something of the other; Jesus, a realisation of, and inspiration for, His own mission; John, a recognition of the fact that his own message was incomplete, that much remained to be done before the coming of the Great Day, and that there was a gift to be had from God for the salvation of human souls, which he himself could not pretend to convey. And so, when Jesus in His turn went up into the wilderness, John remained quiescent; for he felt that his message was delivered, his mission accomplished, and that he might now leave events in Jesus' hands. He awaited the course of circumstances which he anticipated, in patience for a while; only bearing witness, as he had done in the past, that the Messiah was near at hand, and speaking more emphatically, than was his wont before Jesus' baptism, of the Spirit-baptism the Messiah would dispense, to those who sought to him for guidance and counsel. But Jesus was a long while absent; the days passed slowly by; the weeks mounted into months; John fasted and prayed,

in company with a few devoted adherents who clung to him in his new seclusion, and to whom he may have imparted his impression of Jesus under the seal of secrecy ; but still Jesus made no great move. He heard of Him, indeed, that He had journeyed down to Galilee, that He had been up to Jerusalem, that He was working some miracles, going about doing good, preaching a reformation of life, and announcing the coming of the Kingdom ; but he did not gather that Jesus had ever referred to Himself as the Messiah. John became disturbed and seriously perplexed ; he began to entertain doubts as to the accuracy of his judgment at the baptismal scene. His emotions had been, perhaps, unduly stirred by the strange circumstances of the moment, after a hard day's work, and when he was weakened by fasting. In any case, according to the intelligence which reached him, Jesus did not appear to be doing the work of the Messiah, who should, in John's estimation, boldly claim His throne. This did not seem likely to lead to any great issue. We may take it, perhaps, that Jesus was Himself in some doubt as to the course He should pursue ; for He had not yet learnt that the Kingdom could only be purchased at the price of His life. But, however that may be, John, in his distress, sent two of his disciples to Jesus, to enquire of Him whether indeed the original opinion he had formed, but perhaps never expressed in words, of His Messiahship had been correct or not ; and he received an answer which

appeared to him wholly ambiguous, and entirely disappointing.

5. Thereupon, he decided upon a new move. From being quiescent, he again became active. But his activity was now directed to flow into two channels, both of them novel, and, in a measure which he did not perceive, inconsistent the one with the other. First, allowing free rein to his unhappy dubiety, he resumed his preaching and baptising, lest Jesus should indeed prove not to be the Messiah, and that great Personage was yet to come. He crossed the Jordan, and ascended to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, where at 'Ain Kārim he found the water he needed for his purposes. He now formed a band of disciples around him, making of them a school or college, whom he trained to observe rules of ascetic discipline, and whom he initiated by the rite of baptism. He still proclaimed the Spirit-baptism of the Coming One; but doubtless the enthusiasm of his disciples, and particularly of those who were aware of his disappointment in connection with Jesus, was inclined to minimise that important issue of his work, and to regard John himself as of higher dignity than he cared to claim. Thus there would have arisen a subtle, underground, conflict between the Master's modesty and the disciples' veneration, which would account for much that followed in after years. The second direction which John gave to his newly-found activity would have been irreconcilable with the

former, but that the mind of an enthusiast is frequently so delicately poised amidst the conflicting motives which guide his steps. Determining to force events to an issue, and thus to aid Jesus to claim His own, were He in reality the Messiah, he definitely engaged in propaganda of a political nature. To his former proclamation of the advent of Messiah, he now added further details which were calculated to bring him into personal peril. He spoke at last of the approach of the Messianic Kingdom, of the desirability of upsetting the Hasmonæan dynasty and undermining the Roman overlordship, and of the duty of all patriotic Jews to aid in the restoration of the Davidic line. It was at this point that the authorities began to regard him as a dangerous demagogue, and one with whom it would be wise to deal with great severity. The place where John was baptising, was easily accessible from Jerusalem; and great crowds flocked to him from all quarters, and vociferously proclaimed themselves his adherents, daily expecting him to produce the candidate for the throne, and to lead them on to victory. Jesus, meanwhile, at a little distance, held Himself aloof from this concourse, and waited to see what course events would take. The news reached Antipas in Galilee; and he watched with interest the development of a crisis. Pilate, with the prudence of a Roman official, was determined to remain inactive at Cæsarea, until the first overt deed of rebellion would give



him an excuse for strong measures of repression.

6. But things gathered head with great rapidity. Antipas came down with Herodias to the fortress of Machærus, to celebrate his birthday festivities. From thence it would have been easy for him to have surprised and decimated the unorganised groups which attached themselves to John; and probably Pilate would have had no reason to object to his taking the matter into his hands. But there was an element of indecision in Antipas' character; and prudence would have him weigh all the circumstances. On the one hand there was John's personal popularity amongst the masses of the people, many of whom were possibly the subjects of Antipas; and so effectually did he incite them to the championship of the Messianic cause, that they were ready to do his slightest bidding. To have dealt high-handedly with them would have brought a storm of execration upon Herod's head, and might have given rise to serious complications with his own subjects. On the other hand, there was the natural anxiety to secure his own throne from a Messianic claimant; and there was also a desire to win the approval of Rome, lest he should seem to be implicating himself in a movement calculated to undermine her prestige. But his perplexities were not of long duration; for at length John gave him the very opportunity he could have most desired. Leaving his followers in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, the Baptist went, attended by a few

disciples, to Machærus, with the purpose of seeing Antipas, in order to persuade him, or terrify him, into abdicating his throne in favour of the Messiah. Arrived at the castle, at first he was unsuccessful in his attempts to gain an audience. Not to be baffled, however, he threw caution to the winds, and publicly, in the courtyard of the fortress, he arraigned the King for his infamous domestic relations. The ruse achieved its object; and the intelligence was carried post-haste to the royal pair. At Herodias' urgent request, the Baptist and his disciples were instantly arrested, and thrown into a dungeon cell. But the queen could not at once prevail upon Herod to have him executed; so fearful was Antipas of any rash and precipitate action. The news, however, was quickly carried to his followers at 'Ain Kārim; who, in mingled disappointment and fear, rapidly dispersed. Jesus, as we know, forthwith fled to Galilee. As the days passed by, Herod, to satisfy a natural curiosity, had John brought before him; and, somewhat to his surprise, was considerably impressed by the spiritual force and nobility of the prophet. Feeling that, in captivity, his influence on the people was broken, Herod was the more anxious to preserve him alive; and on several occasions he saved him from the evil machinations of Herodias. But at length a trick served her turn, and John's head fell by the executioner's sword. His fellow-captives' lives were spared; and, on being set

free, they were allowed to inter their master's corpse in a rock-hewn tomb on the hill-side. And so the career of a great prophet was prematurely cut short, while he was still persisting in a misapprehension, which a more matured study of Jesus' life and character might have removed. The news of his death was carried far and wide by his disciples. To Jesus, who thereupon retired beyond the boundaries of Galilee, it came as a crushing blow. But to the Baptist's adherents the intelligence but added venom to their feelings for Antipas.

7. John's great error, which he carried with him to the grave, was perpetuated after his death by his faithful disciples. Among them arose, as we have seen, a plentiful crop of religious sects, to whom the Baptist was, in some respects, like a modern-day Mahdi. These men had fertile soil to work upon, in the imaginations of the multitudes their Master had so wonderfully stirred. Baptists and Hemerobaptists, Dositheans and Boëthusians, and perhaps many more, all owed something to the personality of the prophet, whose memory they cherished for many generations to come. It is not a matter of surprise that the earliest disciples, and those who came to throw in their lot with them, should have come to deem their Master the Messiah, when we recall the disappointment they shared with John about Jesus, and remember both how vigorously he had preached that sublime Personality in the last few weeks of his freedom, and

how he had initiated the crowds of his adherents by baptism into a church of his own creation. A comparison of him with Jesus, whose life's work was of a less imaginative cast, would probably have been to the detriment of the latter. And when, after the Roman campaign and the fall of Jerusalem, they had dispersed far afield, to Alexandria, Damascus or Ephesus, they would have easily forgotten Him who had less powerfully attracted them; while their reverence for the Baptist drove them to form a cult in his memory.

8. The career of the Baptist is as strange and pathetic as any we read of in the whole range of history. He was as some wandering comet, attracted out of the dark unknown to our universe, which, after a rapid passage around the sun, has again strayed into the limitless abyss of space. But perhaps he is not lost to us in reality. For as a comet is now and again captured by the force of the attraction it has once felt, so may the Baptist, after a long orbit in the outer darkness, once more respond to the Divine call, and come to shelter himself in the life-giving rays of the Sun of Righteousness.



## APPENDED NOTES

<sup>2</sup> The traditional scene of the Baptism is Makhādet Ḥajla, at the junction of the Wādy-el-Ḳelt with the Jordan. But it is obvious that this tradition can rest upon no solid foundation in fact; for Lk. tells us that the Baptism was private, "after all the people," on that particular day, "had been baptised," and had departed; and if the locality had been communicated by John or Jesus, we should certainly have expected it to have found a place in the Synoptists. On the other hand, it may well be that the 4th Gospel is right in fixing Jesus' Baptism at one of the two places which an early tradition had ascribed to John's activities. What were these places? (a) Bethany (Jn. i. 28). The reading Bethabara is not supported by the best texts, and is due to a topographical conjecture by Origen. cf. Origen: "*Commentary on St. John*," vi. 24. But it is an interesting possibility that the original of both readings was a name which combined the elements of both; not Βηθαβαρα, nor Βηθανια, but Βηθαβαβαρα. Now in Josh. xiii. 27 (LXX) we have Βαινθαβαβαρα, which is sufficiently close, to represent בֵּית נִמְרָה Beth Nimrah is well known; and Jn. iii. 26 places Bethany "beyond Jordan." It is accessible from Jerusalem and the Jericho region (cf. Mt. iii. 5); and the Nahr Nimrān, which flows into the Jordan, has a plentiful water supply. (b) Ænon (Jn. iii. 22, 23). Tradition places Ænon at Umm-el-'Amdān, about 7 miles from Beisān, where there are several springs. But no names similar to Ænon or Sālim are

to be found in that locality. Conder identifies Ænon with the springs between the well-known Sālim (near Nāblus) and 'Ainun, in the Wādy Fāri'a; a locality which is easily accessible from Jerusalem and Galilee. But to this it may be objected that the springs are seven miles from Sālim. It is to be noticed (i) that Jesus was baptising in the country districts of Judæa, and evidently not far from John; and (ii) that the expression "near Sālim" is introduced into the narrative to explain how it was that the Jews had ready access to John. In these circumstances it may be legitimate to amend the text, reading ἐγγὺς Ἱερουσαλήμ for ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ. In that case, it would be natural to identify Ænon with 'Ain Kārim, which is near Jerusalem, which possesses in its S. Mary's Well and the adjacent 'Ain el-Habs (Hermits' Fountain) abundance of water, and has been connected by Christian tradition with the Baptist. (cf. *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. i. cols. 547-549; vol. iv. col. 4245). It will be noticed that we have two scenes of John's baptising, which correspond with two periods of his ministry. Beth Nimrah, where he worked, up to, and including, Jesus' Baptism; a locality at some little distance from Jerusalem, beyond Jordan. And 'Ain Kārim, situated nearer the city, where he appeared for a subsequent period of activity.

<sup>3</sup> So Swete, "*S. Mark*," p. 7; Allen, "*S. Matthew*," p. 27. See however Moulton, "*Prolegomena*," pp. 216f. " . . . purpose is not to be pressed into any example of τοῦ (*c. inf.*) where the context does not demand it." But illustrations of purpose in Jesus' actions may be found, for example, in Mt. iv. 1, Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος, πείρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. Mt. xvi. 21. Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν . . . καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι.

<sup>4</sup> Mk. has ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος; but Mt. substitutes ἀπό. In other words, Mk. represents the rending of the heavens as occurring at the moment Jesus raised His head from the water; Mt., at the moment He stepped

out of the river. For the curious tradition of "a fire kindled in Jordan," cf. Justin Martyr, "*Dialogue with Trypho*," lxxxviii. The rule for the baptising of proselytes was to this effect. The proselyte stood in water reaching to his neck, during the recitation of the great commandments of the Law, and then plunged his head beneath, totally submerging himself. See, however, the discussion in "*Journal of Theol. Studies*," vol. xii. pp. 437-445, 609-612; vol. xiii. pp. 411-414. There is, indeed, no evidence for the baptising of proselytes before the end of the 2nd cent. A.D.; and therefore nothing to prove that John was in any way indebted to that rite. But there are strong reasons for supposing that proselyte baptism considerably ante-dated the Johannine. See Edersheim, "*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*," vol. ii. App. xii.; Hastings' "*Dictionary of the Bible*," vol. i. pp. 239f.

<sup>6</sup> For example, cf. Wisdom i. 5-7: "For the Holy Spirit of discipline will flee deceit . . . For Wisdom is a loving Spirit . . . The Spirit of the Lord filleth the world." "*Ascension of Isaiah*," v. 14: "And when Isaiah was being sawn in sunder, he neither cried aloud nor wept, but his lips spake with the Holy Spirit until he was sawn in twain." See Oesterley and Box, "*Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*," pp. 210-217. For the "rending of the heavens," we may refer to Ez. i. 1: "The heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God;" and the apocalyptic language of Jn. i. 51: "Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man," which has a back reference to Gen. xxviii. 12.

<sup>7</sup> Gen. i. 2. מְרוֹחֶסֶת. In Hebrew poetry the dove was symbolic of gentleness and grace. cf. Cant. v. 2; Is. lx. 8; Ez. vii. 16; Nahum ii. 7; and thus naturally appropriate to the Holy Spirit. The three words, תוֹר "turtle-dove," יִבְנָה "dove," and גִּזְלָה "young pigeon," are but three varieties of the same species, and may be treated together. Thus we find that while the dove was regarded as "clean," it was not apparently used as an article of diet. It may be that it is intended



by the "bird" צִיפור in Lev. xiv. 49-53, which is used in a purificatory rite; but at least the dove was commonly used for sacrificial purposes, in those cases where there was no sacrificial meal; cf. Lev. v. 7; xii. 8; Lk. ii. 24; cp. Gen. xv. 9; and it appears to have been sold in the Temple for that purpose, Mt. xxi. 12; Mk. xi. 15; Jn. ii. 14, 16. The use of the dove in sacrifice was common to many Semitic peoples; cf. Robertson Smith, *"Religion of the Semites,"* pp. 219 (note 2), 294. *Ency. Bib.* vol. i. cols. 1129, 1130. These three uses of the dove, sacrificed for a purification, for a covenant (cf. Skinner, *"Genesis,"* p. 283; R. Smith, *op. cit.* pp. 479-481), and for a purgation, are all capable of a spiritualising interpretation, which would justify the present symbolism. Compare *"Odes of Solomon,"* xxiv. 1, "The Dove fluttered over the Messiah, because He was her head."

<sup>9</sup> For the "*Bath Qol*" see Oesterley and Box, *R.W.S.*, pp. 215-217; Dalman, *"Words of Jesus,"* pp. 204, 205. In the "*Pirge Aboth*" (in Taylor's *"Sayings of the Jewish Fathers"*) we read: "Every day a בַּת-קוֹל goes forth from Mount Horeb, etc." (vi. 2). Instances in the N.T. are: the Transfiguration, Mt. xvii. 5; the visit of the Greeks to Jesus, Jn. xii. 28-30; Paul's Conversion, Ac. ix. 3-7; cp. the Voices of the thunders, Rev. x. 4; and the Voice of the Spirit, Rev. xiv. 13.

<sup>10</sup> The incident of the Transfiguration will be discussed later; but here we may cite the various forms of that Voice. Mk. ix. 7: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. Mt. xvii. 5: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. Lk. ix. 35: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. 2 P. i. 17: Ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν, εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα. We have first to notice that the "this" of the Transfiguration becomes the "thou" of the Baptism, in Mk.; possibly suggesting a private address, unheard by the Baptist. Next, we should translate "Thou art my Son, the Beloved, etc." ὁ ἀγαπητός is a Messianic title; comp.

ὁ ἠγαπημένος, Eph. i. 6 (cf. Col. i. 13, 14). See A. Robinson, "*Ephesians*," pp. 229-233; "*Ascension of Isaiah*," iii. 13, and passim. Lk.'s ἐκλελεγμένος = עֲבָדָי of Is. xlii. 1; cf. Lk. xxiii. 35; "*Eth. Enoch*," xl. 5; cf. Swete, "*St. Mark*," p. 180. The editorial citation of Is. xlii. 1, in Mt. xii. 18-21, has ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. The original reads: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth." עֲבָדָי "servant" is represented in the LXX by παῖς; but here υἱός is substituted. Possibly a recollection of Ps. vii. 7, has suggested this; for "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee," is a "western interpolation" in Lk. iii. 22. Perhaps we may say that the Transfiguration was a public proclamation by Jesus to His disciples, of that Messianic consciousness into which we see His initiation at the Baptism. Putting aside the evidence of the 4th Gospel, which we shall examine later, it seems likely that the events of the Baptism were not disclosed by John; and that Jesus' lips were sealed about them, at least until after the Transfiguration.

<sup>12</sup> Ἐγένετο cannot mean "came" (παρεγένετο). The sense is rather "first came to men's notice." Ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ must go with ἐγένετο; for the baptising would not be in the desert, but where there were ὕδατα πολλὰ (Jn. iii. 23). The ὁ may have slipped in through confounding βαπτίζων with βαπτιστής; εἰ βαπτίζων may represent an earlier βαπτιστής, with which the ὁ would have been in place. The former conjecture is preferable, and has some support in the καὶ which some texts supply with κηρύσσων. cf. *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii. col. 2499 (note 1). From this we derive an indication of two stages in the Baptist's career; first his solitary appearance in the desert, and then his ministry of preaching and baptising. And this view is confirmed by the notices in Mt. iii. 5, Lk. iii. 3, which represent the authority of Q. Mt. has, in addition to Mk.'s (i. 5) "there went out unto him all the country of Judæa, and all they of Jerusalem," the expression "all

the region round about Jordan" (περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου); adding, with Mk., that they were baptised in Jordan. Lk., having stated that the Word of God came to John in the desert, goes on to say, "and he came into all the region round about Jordan, preaching, etc." Thus we may take it that Jn.'s preaching started in the Judæan wilderness (Mt. iii. 1), and that, at a certain stage in that preaching, he left the wilderness for the neighbourhood of Jordan, where he commenced his baptising.

<sup>13</sup> In Mark we have two quotations, Mal. iii. 1 and Is. xl. 3, joined under the name Isaiah. Possibly the author was using a collection of excerpts in which he found the two texts in that position on a leaf headed "*Isaiah*." cf. Swete, "*S. Mark*," p. 2. In Mt. iii. 3, Lk. iii. 4-6 Malachi is not quoted; but the passage appears in another context in Mt. xi. 10 and Lk. vii. 27. Lk. adds Is. xl. 5. That John preferred this nebulous title appears in Jn. i. 20-23, supported by the silence of the Synoptists as to his having claimed any other.

<sup>15</sup> It is impossible to say whether this confession implies more than a general acknowledgment of sin, demanded as a proof of fitness for baptism, just as an acknowledgment of belief in Jesus was afterwards made a condition of Christian baptism (cf. Ac. viii. 37, which has some MS. authority). The root meaning of יָדָה is "to throw," "to cast." In *Hiph.* it has the meaning of "to give thanks," "to confess (belief)," "to praise." In *Hithp.* "to confess (sins)." cf. "*Oxford Hebrew Lexicon*." The word is expressive of the symbolical gesture of prayer, the spreading forth of the hands in worship, as implying a yielding up of what is within. The High-priest made a liturgical confession of sin on the Day of Atonement, and such liturgical forms are still in use on that day in Jewish communities. An example of such confession is to be found in Neh. ix., and a sort of direction for this usage may be seen in 1 K. viii. 33-40. For confession, in a representative sense but not liturgical, see Dan. ix.; Is. lxiii. 7—lxiv. 12. An individual act of confession is that of Achan, Josh. vii.

19; and we have a recommendation to this individual usage in Prov. xxviii. 13. But the early Christian practice of James v. 16 must have had its roots in Jewish custom.

17 To seal a document, by immemorial usage, is to make the sense of that document binding, definite, and final. So a rite may be regarded as a seal, or pledge, of the reality of that which it symbolises. Paul regards circumcision as the seal of a covenant relationship with God (Ro. iv. 11). And the same term, σφραγίς, σφραγίζω, came to be used for Christian baptism, which was an outward pledge of the gift of the Spirit. Eph. i. 13; 2 Cor. i. 22. cf. Sanday and Headlam, "*Romans*," p. 107. *Pseudo-Clement of Rome*: 2 Cor. vii. τῶν γὰρ μὴ τηρησάντων, φησὶν, τὴν σφραγίδα κ.τ.λ.; and see Lightfoot's note, "*Apostolic Fathers*," vol. ii. p. 226. As Jewish circumcision and Christian baptism, so John's baptism was a seal—of repentance. See also Schweitzer, "*Quest of the Historical Jesus*," pp. 375, 376. "*Apost. Const.*" ii. 39; iii. 16; vii. 20.

18 Comp. Mk. i. 15. Πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. cf. Mt. iii. 17. See Wright, "*Synopsis of Gospels in Greek*," p. 5. Lk. iii. 18, is also editorial; added at a time when Jesus' work was seen to be a direct continuation of John's; or, rather, when John's was lost sight of in that of Jesus. For the "Gospel" was surely preached by Jesus, not John. cp. Mk. i. 1, 14. Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

20 On the whole problem of Jewish eschatology, see A. Robertson, "*Regnum Dei*," Lect. I-III; Charles, "*Critical Hist.*," Articles "*Eschatology*" in Hastings' *D.B.*, vol. 1, and *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii; E. F. Scott, "*Kingdom and the Messiah*;" and Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.* chaps. x. and xi. cf. "*Journ. Theol. Studies*," vol. xii. pp. 57-98. It is impossible to do more here than briefly illustrate the subject by a few citations. In the O.T. the Day of the Lord is variously conceived; we notice

particularly that in Amos it is to be a judgment upon sinners, and that the house of Israel will suffer. cf. v. 18, 20; iii. 2. cp. Mt. iii. 9. The Kingdom is to be a theocratic state, with its centre at Jerusalem; Mic. iv. 1, 2 (=Is. ii. 2, 3); and this will involve a political equality for Israel with the great world powers (Is. xix. 24). The Messianic King is to be of David's line, and he assumes super-human proportions (Is. ix. 6, 7). In the pseudepigraphical books the scene is constantly shifting. Sometimes we have the following series of events: (i) Messianic conquest, and founding of a millennial Kingdom; (ii) Resurrection and Day of Judgment; (iii) Final apportionment of spiritual rewards and punishments to the righteous and sinners. But this is again reversed: (i) Appearance of Messiah to Judgment; (ii) Establishment of Kingdom after Resurrection; (iii) A final condition of spiritual bliss or pain. Every feature does not always appear; and the conceptions of the Messiah and the Kingdom vary between the human and mundane, and the semi-Divine and spiritual. The following are a few excerpts illustrating these different views:—"*Ethiopic Enoch*": "Such will be the lot of the sinners who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits, who are thus preserved for the day of suffering and tribulation. On that day Mine Elect One will sit on the throne of glory and make choice amongst their deeds, and their mansions will be innumerable, and their souls will grow strong within them when they see Mine elect ones and those who have called upon My glorious name. And on that day I will cause Mine Elect One to dwell among them, and I will transform the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light. And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing and cause Mine elect ones to dwell upon it." (xlv. 2<sup>b</sup>—5<sup>a</sup>). "And he said unto me, 'All these things which thou hast seen serve the dominion of His Anointed that he may be potent and mighty on the earth.'" (lii. 4). "And then when unrighteousness and sin and blasphemy and violence in all kinds of deeds will increase, and apostasy and transgression and uncleanness increase, a great chastisement from heaven will come upon them all, and the holy Lord will come forth with wrath and chastisement to execute

judgment on earth." (xci. 7). cf. also xc. 20-27. "Psalms of Solomon": ἡ ἀπώλεια τοῦ ἀμαρτωλοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθῆσεται ὅταν ἐπισκέπτηται δίκαιους. (iii. 13<sup>b</sup>, 14). Καὶ ἀπολοῦνται ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως Κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ὅταν ἐπισκέπτηται ὁ Θεὸς τὴν γῆν ἐν κρίματι αὐτοῦ, ἀποδοῦναι ἀμαρτωλοῖς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον. οἱ δὲ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον ἐλεηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ. (xv. 13<sup>b</sup>-15<sup>a</sup>). Καὶ οὐχ εὐρεθήσονται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐλέους δικαίων. (xiv. 6<sup>b</sup>). Καὶ ἡ χρηστότης σου ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. εὐλογημένη ἡ δόξα Κυρίου ὅτι αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν. (v. 21<sup>b</sup>, 22). "Ἰδε, Κύριε, καὶ ἀνάστησιν αὐτοῖς τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν, υἱὸν Δαυὶδ, εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ὃν ἶδες σύ, ὁ Θεός, τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ παῖδά σου, . . . καὶ συνάξει λαὸν ἅγιον οὗ ἀφηγήσεται ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ κρινεῖ φυλὰς λαοῦ ἡγιασμένου ὑπὸ Κυρίου Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, . . . καὶ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς δίκαιος, διδασκὸς, ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, ἐπ' αὐτούς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν" ὅτι πάντες ἅγιοι, καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν χριστὸς κύριος. (xvii. 23, 28, 35<sup>b</sup>, 36). "Slavonic Enoch": "Then I can also take thee in My second coming. . . Let there be at the beginning of the eighth thousand a time when there is no computation, and no end; neither years, nor months, nor weeks, nor days, nor hours." (xxxii. 1; xxxiii. 2. God's second advent—the first having been Creation—will be at the end of the world; and this will usher in a spiritual millennium). "Apocalypse of Baruch": "And it will come to pass when all is accomplished that was to come to pass in those parts, that Messiah will then begin to be revealed." (xxix. 3). "And it will come to pass after these things, when the time of the advent of the Messiah is fulfilled, and He will return in glory, then all who have fallen asleep in hope of Him shall rise again." (xxx. 1). "Assumption of Moses": "And then His Kingdom will appear throughout all His creation . . . \*. For the Heavenly One will arise from His royal throne, and He will go forth from His holy habitation, and His wrath will burn on account of His sons . . . For the Most High will arise, the Eternal God alone, and He will appear to punish the Gentiles." (x. 1, 3, 7.)

<sup>24</sup> It may be well here to say something of the sources of the passages under discussion. In the first place we notice that the account of the Baptist in Mt. and Lk. is much richer and fuller than that in Mk. Streeter holds that Q, from which Mt. and Lk. draw, was Palestinian in origin; and that, since all "held John to be a prophet indeed," he would naturally have occupied a large place in such a document. While, on the other hand, Mk.'s audience, having a great reverence for the O.T., and no particular interest in the personality of the Baptist, would have been more concerned in John's fulfilment of prophecy as Jesus' precursor (cf. i. 2; ix. 11, 12) than in his own independent teaching. cf. "*Oxford Studies*," p. 217. Here, as elsewhere, Mt. (iii. 1-12) conflates Mk. (i. 2-8) with Q, while Lk. has no Markan material; unless, as Streeter thinks, Mk. i. 7, 8, was also derived from Q. cf. *op. cit.* pp. 167, 168. It is a possibility that, if Q represents a "Jesus" cycle of teaching and discourses, then there may have been a "John" cycle also, from which Mt. iii. 7-10; Lk. iii. 7-9 was drawn. Mt. has it that many Pharisees and Sadducees came to hear John, and were severely handled by him; and this probably represents what was in his source. Lk.'s introduction of the "multitudes" was calculated to minimise the Baptist's antagonism to the formalism and hypocrisy of the Jewish sects, and to lift the teaching out of its purely evanescent conditions. Mt. iii. 7-12 (=Lk. iii. 7-9, 16, 17) is probably a patchwork of fragments, an artificial production; but it has little coherence. Verse 11, for instance, does not accord with the tone of 7. Verse 12 is reminiscent of Mt. xiii. 30, 41, 42; verses 8, 9 are probably from the same source as Jn. viii. 37-39. A re-ordering of the verses, as follows, gives a good sense: 7<sup>b</sup>, 10, 8, 9; which is then reminiscent of Mt. xii. 33, 34. cf. *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii. col. 2500. It must be carried in mind that these fragments belonged, in all probability, to different periods in John's career; but so little do we know of the characteristics of those periods, that we could not with any certainty place these fragments in their proper settings.

<sup>25</sup> With "the wrath to come," cp. "*Eth. Enoch*."

"I saw till the Lord of the sheep came unto them and took the staff of His wrath in His hand and smote the earth so that it was rent asunder" (xc. 18). "*Book of Jubilees*": "The day of wrath" (xxiv. 30). cf. Ro. i. 18; ii. 5; 1 Th. i. 10; Rev. vi. 16. Notice that the whole passage is Messianic. The Day of the Lord implies the coming of Messiah. But there is no hint of the Kingdom. It is worthy of attention that John never uses any of the Messianic titles in his preaching. But there is really no ambiguity in his reference, for all that. John is not concerned with a Kingdom; but his conception of Messiah implies a Kingdom, and that a temporal one. How is his Day of the Lord related to this Kingdom? Is it thrust into the far background? Probably the relation was close. The Day is no longer the end of the world, to him, but the day of Messiah's triumph over His enemies; he was not thinking of an Armageddon, but of a human battlefield. Thus we see a change in the character of his teaching. Before he had any distinct consciousness of the coming of Messiah, his Day meant the universal wrath of God upon sinners; now it is the final triumph of Messiah in the inauguration of His Kingdom.—For the Jewish plea of descent from Abraham as assuring them of God's favour, and the prophetic and apostolic answer to this, see Ro. ii. 17-29; Am. iii. 2; Jn. viii. 37-39.

<sup>28</sup> Purificatory rites are universal, and may be roughly classified under the three-fold usage of Blood, Fire, and Water. Of the ritual of Blood, which does not directly concern us here, we need only say that it was probably a commoner form of purification under the old Law than the, perhaps, later lustrations by water. cf. Lev. xxvi. 14; xiv. 4-7; Ex. xii. 22; xxix. 16; Lev. xiv. 14; xvi. 14-19. But John pointed to the Messianic baptism as being "with the Holy Ghost and fire" (Mt. iii. 11); therefore a little space must be devoted to the idea of purification by fire. The ritual of fire was, of course, connected always with Sun-worship. The worship of celestial bodies was peculiarly abhorrent to the prophets and law-givers of Israel, probably because it was characteristic of their Canaanite neighbours, and



therefore the nearest temptation to national apostasy. Thus any rite associated with such worships was banned and made subject to the death penalty. Such a rite was that of passing children through the fire to Moloch; by which we should understand, not a species of human sacrifice, but a purification which put the children under the special protection of the god. cf. Lev. xviii. 21; xx. 2-5; 2 K. xxiii. 10; Jer. xxxii. 35. The place called Tophet gained an unenviable reputation from this practice. The milder Greek custom, of passing the child round the hearth, ἀμφιδρόμια, probably had the same significance. cf. Farnell, "*Evolution of Religion*," p. 57. It is related that mediæval travellers who visited the Tartar Khan were obliged to pass between two fires, in order to purge away any magic influence they might otherwise exert upon their host. cf. Frazer, "*Golden Bough*," vol. i. p. 308. The whole story of the worship of Baphomet by the Templers, with their mystic fire-baptism, is probably a fabrication; but at least it witnesses to the perpetuation of the idea of purification by fire. cf. Milman, "*Latin Christianity*," vol. vii. p. 278. Lustrations by water had their origin in animistic conceptions. cf. Ex. xxix. 4; xxx. 18-21; Num. viii. 7, 21. Their fundamental meaning was far from being hygienic; it was, rather, an attempt to purge away all evil influences, by which were meant spiritual influences which were regarded as potent at particular times in life. Of this order were the lustrations of the woman after child-birth, and of the newborn child, of those who had been in contact with a dead body at a funeral; and even the lustrations preceding or following a meal. cf. Mt. xxiii. 25, 26; and cp. "*Berakhoth*" viii. 4. "Shammai says (after the repast) one must first sweep the chamber, then perform the ablution (a fresh one); Hillel prescribes the reverse." In New Guinea, a homicide washed to rid him of the ghost of his victim; cp. Num. xxxi. 19; Basutos wash after a battle, for the same reason. cf. Frazer, *op. cit.* vol. i. pp. 333, 334. For washing after contact with a corpse, cf. Num. xix. 13. The washing of a new-born child, and the name-giving, frequently take place on the

same occasion, as with the Maoris of New Zealand; but they have no original connection. cf. Tylor, "*Primitive Culture*," vol. ii. p. 430. It is not a long step from the purgation of evil influences to that of moral guilt, which is often regarded as a kind of dæmoniacal possession. Thus we find that it was customary for the Incas to bathe in a river and recite the following formula: "O thou River, receive the sins I have this day confessed unto the Sun; carry them down to the sea, and let them never more appear." cf. Tylor, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 435. With this may be compared the modern custom of Jews in Morocco, who, on New Year's Day, will go to the sea-shore, or to some spring, and remove the burden of their sins by casting stones into the water. cf. Westermarck, "*Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*," vol. i. p. 55. The Greek mysteries developed the idea of baptism as a rite of initiation, and as a sort of regeneration. cf. Farnell, *op. cit.* p. 157; and cp. Harrison, "*Prolegomena to Greek Religion*," p. 596; Jevons, "*Introduction to History of Religion*," p. 339. We may see a prophetic movement towards this view in Is. i. 16; Zech. xiii. 1; Ez. xxxvi. 24-27. Of the baptism of proselytes, forming, together with circumcision and sacrifice, the prescribed mode of entry to the full privileges of Judaism, we have already spoken. cf. Schürer, "*History of Jewish People*," Div. ii. vol. ii. pp. 319-324. The baptismal rite in use amongst the Essenes is discussed in Lightfoot, "*Colossians and Philemon*," 'Dissertation on the Essenes,' pp. 409, 410.

<sup>32</sup> We must here follow up what was said in Note 28 about purification by fire, with some special remarks upon Tophet. This place, situated in the Valley of Hinnom, and within full view of the walls of Jerusalem, was sacred to the worship of Moloch. (For the name and nature of this deity, cf. *Ency. Bib.* vol. iii. cols. 3183-3191.) The word תפת was probably Aramaic, and is connected with the Hebrew מִשְׁפָּחָה, a hearth. cf. R. Smith, *op. cit.* p. 377 (note 2). It was, very possibly, a large pit or trench in connection with a High Place. cf. Is. xxx. 33. There can be no doubt that human

sacrifices, and in particular child sacrifices, were perpetrated in the worship of Moloch; but that does not exclude the purificatory rite, which may have existed side by side with the more savage custom, or have been a milder survival of it. cf. Jer. vii. 31, 32; xix. 4-6; Ez. xvi. 21; xxiii. 37-39; Deut. xii. 31; xviii. 10; 2 K. xvii. 31; Ps. cvi. 37; cp. Gen. xxii. The memory of the horrors of this ritual lingered in popular lore, and had a powerful influence in shaping the eschatological conceptions of the apocalyptic writers. cf. *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii. cols. 2070-2072, 1360, 1361, 1365, 1371. Gehenna is probably implied in Dan. xii. 2. "*Eth. En.*" xxvii. 1, 2, "this accursed valley . . . the place of their punishment." cp. xc. 26, 27; xlviii. 9, "before the face of the righteous;" cf. Is. lxvi. 24, "they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me." "*Eth. En.*" liv. 1, 2; lxii. 12, 13. Possibly a reference may be found in Wisd. iv. 19. See 2 Esdras, vii. 36, "the pit of torment . . . the furnace of hell." "*Apocalypse of Baruch*," lix. 10, "the mouth of Gehenna." "*Assumption of Moses*," x. 10; "Thou wilt look from on high and wilt see thy enemies in Gehenna." In "*Slav. En.*" Gehenna has developed the features of a mediæval Hell. cf. xl. 12; xli. 2; x. For the Synoptic use of this conception, cf. Mt. v. 22, 29, 30; x. 28; xviii. 9; xxiii. 15, 33; Mk. ix. 43, 45, 47; Lk. xii. 5. cp. Jas. iii. 6. See also Mt. iii. 12, *πυρὶ ἀσβέστω*, and kindred passages. The fire of Gehenna is thought of as consuming, not the individual, but the sin which is the reason of his being in that place. Thus we get the meaning of the dual baptism. The fire is not complementary to the Holy Ghost, but the grim alternative. The baptism conveys the Spirit to the worthy recipient; but those whose sin makes the reception of the Spirit impossible, find in the baptism a purgative, or destructive, fire. Compare the similar thought in connection with the reception of the Communion, in 1 Cor. xi. 27-30. (In "*Pirqe Aboth*," v. 9, one of the ten things said to have been created on the eve of the Sabbath was *הקשטיר*, a worm connected with the legendary history of Solomon. Have we in Mk. ix. 48, a reference to this?)

<sup>33</sup> Repentance seems to have formed the substance of the early preaching of Jesus; but it was overshadowed by the new claim of belief. cf. Mk. i. 15. Jesus did not Himself baptise, so we cannot judge what relation repentance had to baptism in His teaching. But later Christian baptism appears to have demanded only faith as its pre-requisite; cf. Mt. xxviii. 19; so that we may perhaps say that repentance was regarded as rather the fruit of the Spirit than the condition of receiving Him. To this it may be objected that, if there were no repentance, there could be no forgiveness by the baptism. But the peculiar significance of the baptism was its gift of the Spirit. This involved a conception of regeneration; and that implied a process, rather than an accomplished fact. The gift was potential, to be translated into terms of actual experience. Thus the severance from the old life by repentance, and the growth of the new life by forgiveness, describe a process which is made possible only by the power of the imparted Spirit.

<sup>38</sup> Allen, "*St. Matthew*," p. 28, understands the words to mean "to leave nothing undone that had been revealed as the righteous will of God;" and he goes on, "John's baptism had the divine sanction, and the Messiah therefore must submit to it." He suggests that the passage is editorial, and was interpolated to explain that the baptism was not the occasion of the inception of Jesus' Messiahhood, which had already been imparted by His Divine paternity. This, however, seems an attempt to escape a difficulty. And, if the conversation is truly reported, the above interpretation robs the words of all but a formal obedience, which again depreciates the real value of John's baptism. We must remember that, to John, "righteousness" was a strictly moral conception, and not contractual; while to Jesus it was something more. We must also recollect that Jesus was making of His baptism something much more than it ever was in John's hands.

<sup>43</sup> It is of interest to see the general support given in patristic writings to the view, expressed in this essay, of the nature of John's baptism, and its relation to

Christian baptism. The following passages are quoted under βάπτισμα, βαπτίζω, in Suicer, "*Thesaurus*," vol. i. cols. 625-627, with his classification.

(α) John's baptism is a preparation for that of Jesus :—

Τέταρτον βάπτισμα, τὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, εἰσαγωγικὸν μὲν, οὐπω δὲ ὅλον πνευματικόν, ἀλλ' εἰς μετάνοιαν μόνον. (Athan. *Quest. ciii. de Parab. Script.*)

Τέταρτον, τὸ Ἰωάννου, εἰσαγωγικὸν ὑπάρχει, καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἄγον τοὺς βαπτιζομένους, ἵνα εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύσωσιν. (Damas. *Orth. Fid.* iv. 10.)

John's baptism is τελειωτικόν . . . ἀναχώρησιν τῆς ἀμαρτίας : that of Jesus, οἰκείωσιν πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ . . . νιοθεσίας. (Basil, *Ex. ad Bap.* Hom. xiii.)

John's is "preparationis"; Jesus' "perfectionis" (Tertullian, *De Bap.*).

John's is παρασκευὴ καὶ προσδοποίησις ἑτέρου. (Chrys. *Joh.* i.).

(β) John's baptism had the same value as that of Jesus' disciples, which also did not impart the Holy Spirit :—

Ἐι δέ τις ἐξετάζοι, καὶ τί πλέον εἶχε τὸ τῶν μαθητῶν βάπτισμα τοῦ Ἰωάννου, ἐπείπερ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐβάπτιζον, ἐροῦμεν ὅτι οὐδέν. Ἐκάτερα γὰρ ὁμοίως τῆς ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος χάριτος ἄμοιρα ἦν, καὶ αὐτὰ μία ἀμφοτέροις ἦν τοῦ βαπτίζειν τὸ τῷ Χριστῷ προσάγειν τοὺς βαπτιζομένους. (Chrys. *Joh.* iii. 23).

Οὔτε τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα, οὔτε τὸ τῶν μαθητῶν, παρείχε πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ τὸν καθ' ἑκάστον περιούντες, κηρύξωσι τὸν Χριστὸν, συνεστήσαντο βάπτισμα, τοὺς προστρέχοντας ὄχλους ἀγάγωσι πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν. (Ammon. *Joh.* iii. 26).

(γ) John's baptism did not remit sins; nor did it even give a pledge of their remission; but it was only a baptism of repentance :—

Ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν οὐκ εἶχε τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα. Ἀλλὰ μόνην μετάνοιαν ἐκήρυχθεν ὁ Ἰωάννης, καὶ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν ἔφερεν ἅντι τοῦ, εἰς τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βάπτισμα ὠδήγει, παρ' οὗ ἡ ἄφεσις τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν. (Theophylact, *Mt.* iii.).

Οὐ τελειωτικόν ἐστι τὸ αὐτοῦ βάπτισμα, ἀλλὰ προσδοποιητικὸν τοῦ πνευματικοῦ βαπτίσματος. (Theophylact. *Jn.* i.).

[But some held that John's baptism did remit sins :—

Τὸ δὲ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα πολυπλάσιον εἶχε τὸ πλεόν. οὐδεμίαν γὰρ ἐποιεῖτο διάκρισιν ἁμαρτημάτων. οὐ διαφορὰν ἐπεζήτει θυσίων. οὐκ ἀκρίβειαν ἐποιεῖτο ἀγνισμοῦ. οὐ παρατήρησιν εἶχεν ἡμερῶν, ἢ ὥρων. καὶ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰς μηδὲν ἀναβολῆς γινομένης ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ. Ἄμα τε προσῆλθέ τις ἐξομολογούμενος τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ὅσας δῆποτ' οὖν, καὶ οἷας δῆποτ' οὖν. καὶ ἐβαπτίζετο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐλάμβανε τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων. (Basil, *De Bapt.* i.).

Τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ ῥαντισμοῦ τὸ ἔχον σποδὸν τῆς δαμάλεως, καθαρισμὸν ἐποίει ἀκουσίων ἁμαρτημάτων, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ ἀφῆς νεκρῶν ἐκάθαιρε· τὸ δὲ Ἰωάννου Βάπτισμα τοῖς γνησίως μετανοοῦσι καὶ τῶν ἐκουσίων παρέιχεν ἄφεσιν. (Ammonius, *Jn.* iii.).]

(δ) John's baptism was superior to that of Moses, but inferior to that of Jesus.

Τὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα τοῦ μὲν Ἰουδαϊκοῦ σφόδρα ὑψηλότερον ἦν, τοῦ δὲ ἡμετέρου ταπεινότερον, καθάπερ γέφυρά τις ὃν ἐκατέρων τῶν βαπτισμάτων, ἀπ' ἐκείνου πρὸς τοῦτο χειρῶν γοῦν. (Chrys. *Hom.* lxxiv.).

Ἐβάπτισε καὶ Ἰωάννης, οὐκέτι μὲν Ἰουδαϊκῶς· οὐ γὰρ ἐν ὕδατι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν· οὐπω δὲ ὅλον πνευματικῶς. οὐ γὰρ προστίθῃσι τὸ ἐν πνεύματι. Βαπτίζει καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι· τοῦτο ἡ τελειότης. (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxxix.).

There were some who said to Eulogius—

Ὅτε ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ἀτελὲς βάπτισμα ἦν βεβαπτισμένος. τὸ Ἰωάννου μόνον ἐβεβάπτιστο. τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα οὐπω ἦν δεδεγμένως. μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦτο, πεντήκοντα ἡμερῶν διαγεγονυῖων ἐδέκατο.

To whom Eulogius replied—

Καὶ τὸ Ἰωάννου τότε τέλειον ἦν. ὕστερον δ' ἀπέβη τοῖς χρωμένοις ἀτελὲς, μεθ' ὃ τὸν τρόπον τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὁ Σωτὴρ παραδιδούς τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἔλεγε· πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε ἅντα τὰ ἔθνη, κ.τ.λ.

And he gave two reasons for this opinion—

(1) Ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ φαίνεται τοὺς μαθητὰς τὸ παρὰ Ἰωάννου δεδεγμένους βάπτισμα, ἀναβαπτίσας. (2) Ὅτι

ὁ Σωτὴρ βαπτισθῆναι αὐτὸ οὐκ ἀπαξιώσας, ὅτι τέλειον ἦν ἑδεξεν. (In Photius. *Cod.* cclxxx.).

<sup>46</sup> It is interesting to notice that the ambiguous "they" of Mk. becomes "the disciples of John" in Mt., and "the Pharisees and their scribes" in Lk.; for, since Lk. connects the two incidents, the interlocutors of v. 33 are the same as those of v. 30. While Mt. and Mk. couch the complaint in the form of a question, Lk. makes a statement of it, with certain expansions:—"The disciples of John fast [often, and make supplications;] likewise also the (disciples) of the Pharisees; but thine eat [and drink.]" So for Mt. and Mk.'s "Can the sons . . . fast?" Lk. has "Can ye make the sons . . . fast?" the former expressing a moral impossibility, the latter a moral worthlessness in the observance.

<sup>47</sup> Notice that Mt. has *πενθεῖν* for Mk.'s *νηστεύειν*. The ideas of fasting and mourning are complementary. In Is. lviii. 5, abstention from food passes into "afflicting the soul." The custom of ceasing to work on the occasion of a death is widespread; it being held that contact with the ghost of the departed would "pollute" the work. So mourners fast because of their uncleanness, and for fear of the pollution of their food; and fasting, being a sign of uncleanness, prohibits contact with other persons. In the same way, days of sacrifice and purification are polluted by contact with Spirits; therefore no work must be done—hence the Sabbath rest—and fasting may become necessary. See Westermarck, *op. cit.* esp. vol. ii. pp. 283, 284, 306, 307.

<sup>48</sup> Lev. xxi. 1-5; Ez. xlv. 25. In Joel ii. 16, a fast of absolutely unprecedented solemnity is in contemplation, which can put an end to marriage festivities. The Talmud enjoins that if a marriage procession should meet a funeral *cortège* it is the latter which must give way; and, during the celebration of a wedding, the guests are even freed of their obligation to dwell in booths, should it fall at the time of the feast of Tabernacles. cf. Edersheim, *op. cit.* vol. i. pp. 663, 664. A

wedding must not take place until a period of mourning is over; cf. for the case of a girl taken in warfare, whose relatives have been slain, Josephus, *Ant.* IV. viii. 23. *Τριάκοντα δ' ἡμερῶν ἐπὶ τῷ πένθει διελθουσῶν, αὐτάρκεις γὰρ ἐπὶ ταῖς δακρύοις αὐται τῶν φιλτάτων τοῖς φρονίμοις, τότε χωρεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν γάμον.* The bridegroom himself fasted as preparation for the function; but his fast ended with the commencement of the wedding festivities. cp. Tobit vi. 15, for purification before marriage.

<sup>49</sup> It is probable that the term, "the bridegroom's friend," was first used by the Baptist of himself, to mark his relation to Jesus, cf. Jn. iii. 29. If so, the adoption by Jesus here of the term "Bridegroom" would have been understood in the light of the Baptist's preaching. cf. Swete, "*St. Mark*," p. 42. The bridegroom's friend was an institution peculiar to Judæa, and would thus be appropriate to John. cf. Edersheim, *op. cit.* vol. i. pp. 354, 355. "Bridegroom" is not a Messianic title; but possibly Hos. ii. 16, 19 ("It shall be in that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali . . . . And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, etc.") was in Jesus' mind. cp. for His further use of the title, Mt. xxv. 1. For the marriage of Christ and His Church, cf. Eph. v. 28-32; of the Lamb and His Bride, Rêv. xix. 7. The bridegroom's friend frequently had to negotiate the marriage on behalf of the parents; and thus the Baptist was acting the part of the Friend, when he made overtures on behalf of the Bridegroom to His people *οἱ ἱδιοὶ*). cp. Paul's case in 2 Cor. xi. 2; cf. Hastings' *Dict. Bib.* vol. ii. p. 327. But, though it is Humanity which Jesus is thus made to woo as His Bride, it seems more natural, in Jn. iii. 28, 29, to understand the Holy Spirit as the Bride. The "sons of the bride-chamber" are simply the wedding guests. For the expression, cf. 1 Macc. iv. 2, "the sons (men) of the citadel"; and see Dalman, "*Words of Jesus*," pp. 115, 116; Trumbull, "*Studies in Oriental Social Life*," pp. 237-254.



<sup>50</sup> Mk. vii. 15. The idea is a two-fold sense of loss; the old cloak is destroyed beyond repair, and the new patch is ineffective. Thus Lk.'s "else he will read the new, and also the piece from the new will not agree with the old," rests upon a misunderstanding of the parable. It is improbable that it is editorial; but it may be due to a mistaken dependence upon the memory in the use of an authority. The parable is illustrated by Mt. xi. 16-19=Lk. vii. 32-35, which we shall consider at a later stage. There we see that John's asceticism was foiled of its purpose, because it had ceased to have any appeal in it to men's consciences, while Jesus' sociability had not yet fallen upon ground where it could be appreciated at its true value.

<sup>51</sup> Here again we have the idea of a dual loss; but the second parable differs from the first in that it supplies a conclusion, which in reality is the conclusion of both; for the parables are complementary. The addition in Mt., "and both are preserved," is also based upon a misconception. The fresh wine-skins are to supplant the old, Christianity is to take the place of Judaism; so far as the new wine of Christianity is concerned, the two cannot exist side by side under the same organisation. They have different motives and different aims; and since Judaism is worn out, it must in time disappear. The addition is clearly editorial.

<sup>52</sup> There can be little doubt that we have in this passage a series of fragmentary testimonies, appended to the incident of John's question, borne by Jesus to the Baptist, which have been independently connected by Mt. and Lk. Owing to the tendency, which we observe in Ac. xviii. 25; xix. 3, to exalt the Baptist, it would have been necessary in Christian circles to lay stress upon the preparatory nature of his office and work. cf. "*Oxford Studies*," p. 127 (note 1). We may regret that this has gone so far as to obscure the independent personality and mission of that interesting character. It seems that episodes, the object of which was to portray the Baptist in this fashion, were characteristic of,

or were incorporated in, Q, from which source Mt. and Lk. are here drawing. cf. *O.S.* pp. 114, 119, 121. The passage falls naturally into two divisions: Mt. xi. 2-11, which agrees in the main with Lk. vii. 18-28; and Mt. xi. 16-19, with Lk. vii. 31-35. It may be said, roughly, that these two were found in different contexts in Q, and were independently united by Mt. and Lk. because of a certain similarity in their contents. cf. Allen, "*St. Matthew*," pp. 113, 114. Mt. xi. 2 = Lk. vii. 18, 19<sup>a</sup>, 20, are evidently editorial expansions of some simple introduction in the original, as "And John sent disciples to Jesus, saying, etc." (for Lk. vii. 17, 18, see Note 54). Lk. vii. 21, is also editorial. It is characteristic of him, as we shall see, to give proofs of Jesus' miraculous powers; and this answers to the fact that in Mt. instances of all these healings have already been related. Mt. xi. 7-11 = Lk. vii. 24-28, with little more than verbal differences which are stylistic. The passage was probably found attached to the former in Q; but there are reasons for doubting whether such was its historical context (cf. Note 54). Mt. xi. 12, 13, is found in Lk. xvi. 16, where it is obviously out of place. Lk. would hardly have inserted it where he does (and it is to be noticed, too, that he reverses the order of the clauses) if he had found it in Q in the context Mt. gives it. Either it was found in Q without a context, and Mt. conflated it with the foregoing, while Lk. was driven to find for it an unsuitable home (cf. *O.S.* pp. 156, 157); or it derives from another source, perhaps oral—for Mt. xi. 12 is differently reported in Lk. Mt. xi. 14 (15 is a usual refrain, editorially introduced) has no place in Lk., and is a conflation from Q; while Lk. vii. 29, 30, which Mt. does not reproduce, is possibly editorial. With little more than stylistic differences, Mt. xi. 16-19 = Lk. vii. 31-35. Now while it is possible analytically to sever these various statements in respect of the Baptist, there is no reason to suppose that they may not severally be traced back to Jesus. Thus they complement each other, and may be exegetically treated as a whole. For this purpose, however, it will obviously be

legitimate to dislocate somewhat the order in which they are found.

<sup>54</sup> In this connection we must notice Lk. vii. 17, 18. Lk. has just related the healing of the Centurion's servant, and the raising of the widow's-son at Nain, which happened ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς (vii. 11). The report of this latter event "went forth . . . in the whole of Judæa, etc.," and John's Disciples related to him "all these things." Lk. (iv. 24-27) has previously, in the sermon at Nazareth, in connection with the proverb "No prophet is acceptable in his own country," made Jesus recall how Elijah and Elisha both worked their chief miracles upon those who were not Jews; intimating that Jesus was conscious of being greater than these prophets of old. To prove this, the story of Nain serves as at least a parallel to the raising of the Shunamite's son. It is also an illustration of the words (vii. 22) "the dead are raised up;" and probably suggested to Lk.'s mind the sequence of events which he gives, where Mt. has no connection. But Lk.'s suggestion, in verses 18, 19, is that the Baptist's question was propounded for the purpose of giving Jesus an opportunity to utter an *apologia*; which is certainly a complete misapprehension of the incident. Brandt has contributed a most interesting solution of Mt. xii. 39-42=Lk. xi. 29-32, which we are strongly tempted to adopt (cf. Cheyne, in *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii. col. 2502). "Jonah" and "John" are identical names (cf. Mt. xvi. 17). יוֹנָה (dove) is a fanciful corruption of יְהוֹנָתָן. In Mt. Ἰωῆ=יוֹנָה a shortened form of יְהוֹנָתָן cf. Jn. i. 43. And, by a play upon the name, Jesus is here testifying, not to Himself, but to the Baptist. The words, as in Mt., were addressed to the Pharisees. John is the sign from heaven which they seek, since John came as a herald to the Messiah; only they are unable to grasp it. Jonah preached to the Ninevites, and they repented; the Pharisees do not repent at the preaching of John. The Queen of Sheba came to hear Solomon's wisdom; the Pharisees will not trouble to learn of John. Yet John

is greater than either Jonah or Solomon. He is not a "reed shaken with the wind" like Jonah (Mt. xi. 7), not a man softly clothed, and living in king's houses, like Solomon (Mt. xi. 8). We must delete Mt. xii. 40, and Lk. xi. 30, as being an editorial misunderstanding of the testimony; and transpose Lk. xi. 31 and 32. Thus we may be able to add another to the cycle of Jesus' testimonies to the person and work of the Baptist. Perhaps, then, Mt. xi. 7-11 = Lk. vii. 24-28, was originally attached to Mt. xii. 39-42 = Lk. xi. 29-32.

<sup>57</sup> It is a possibility to be reckoned with, that this use by Jesus of the title "Son of Man" was a contributory cause to John's perplexity. It would have been natural for him to have asked, "When Jesus spoke of the Son of Man, was He really pointing forward to another than Himself?" The question of this title is discussed very fully by Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, who concludes that Jesus did not make use of it before the confession at Cæsarea Philippi, but then intended it for a Messianic claim; and by Schmidt, in *Ency. Bib.* vol. iv. cols. 4705-4740, with the very negative result that in a large number of instances the title is interpolated, and that in the few which may possibly be attributed to Jesus it has no Messianic implication. It seems to be clear that בן אדם in the O.T. generally signifies "man," and that this was also the Aramaic use, which is therefore in many instances misrepresented by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The one certain exception is Dan. vii. 13, where בן אדם signifies either the people of Israel, or an angel, possibly Michael; though at a later date it was taken to be Messianic, cf. Mt. xxvi. 64 = Mk. xiv. 62. In *Eth. Enoch*, however (xlv. 3; xlvi. 2; xlviii. 2; li. 3; lxii. 6; xlix. 27; cf. Charles' notes, and Appendix, pp. 312-317) the conception is that of a supernatural person, who is definitely named Messiah; and it was probably upon this that the N.T. usage was based. cp. 4 Ezra, xiii. 3-13. The title may have implied "the lowly one," who would, at some future time, be exalted to great dignity; and it seems best to understand it so in the mouth of

Jesus, whose Messiahship was of the future. The title "Anointed One," or "Messiah" (Aram. מָשִׁיחַ = Heb. מָשִׁיחַ cf. Lev. iv. 3) in the O.T. came to be applied to the ideal King, who, being of David's line, would found a temporal Kingdom, after a judgment upon Israel and her enemies alike, and being filled with God's spirit, would realise a theocratic rule on earth, in righteousness. This view was probably held by the mass of the uneducated people in N.T. times, cf. Mt. xxi. 9; Jn. iv. 25. But apocalyptic eschatology gave the conception a new content, which Hellenistic Judaism crystallised in the technical term ὁ Χριστός. The ideal King was relegated to the future, and became entirely a supernatural person; and his place was taken, in human history, by a prophet upon whose advent anticipation was focussed. cf. i Macc. xiv. 41; cp. Lk. xxi. 8. The O.T. conception of "the Servant of the Lord" was understood to refer to the people of Israel, and was not individualised; nor was suffering, the lot of the Servant, thought of in connection with Messiah. Thus we can readily understand why Peter "took (Jesus) and began to rebuke Him" for His prediction of the passion immediately following Peter's confession that He was Christ, at Cæsarea Philippi (cf. Mk. viii. 29-33), and Jesus' answer, "thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men." There is no proof of a belief in a suffering Messiah, until it was evolved in Jewish circles under pressure of Christian beliefs. The conception of two Messiahs, such as we find in the "*Zadokite document*," and in later Gnostic opinion, could have had no place in John's mind; and his conception of Messiah would, almost certainly, have been that of the O.T. Thus his question amounted to "Art thou the King who is to be, of the Davidic line?" (Perhaps the מָלֶכְךָ of Is. lii. 13 is to be found in the διακονέω of Mk. x. 45; and such may be the foundation of the application of the term to Jesus); cp. Ac. iii. 26. To Jesus' consciousness of Himself fulfilling this office, we shall recur later on.

<sup>59</sup> Cp. *Ecclus.* lxviii. 10. *Mt.* xi. 10 and 14 weave together *Mal.* iii. 1 and iv. 5, making the latter distinctly Messianic. The panegyric on John therefore involves the corollary that Messiah is at hand; in fact, remembering, as the people would do, that John had in some sense witnessed to Jesus, the language here employed almost amounts to a direct claim to be the Messiah. But we may ask: (1) Can John have ever publicly proclaimed that Jesus was Messiah? If so, why do we find the people speculatively suggesting all kinds of risen prophets, but never Messiah? (2) Is it at all probable that Jesus ever spoke of John as the Elijah, during the latter's life-time? If so, why did not the title gain credence with the people, amongst whom John was immensely popular? It is only in *Jn.* i. 21, that John denies the title; and though this may be historical, his denial would not have carried much weight with an enthusiastic people. There is another possibility; namely, that the people saw in John the Messiah, in spite of John's denials; and that Jesus' identification of him with Elijah was designed to counteract this dangerous tendency. (3) Is it probable that Jesus should, at this period in His ministry at least, have so clearly announced His Messiahship to the people? If so, why was it necessary for Him to repeat His announcement more explicitly to His disciples, at *Cæsarea Philippi*, and at the Transfiguration? Altogether, we must face the possibility that the passage, as it stands, is not authentic.

<sup>60</sup> Plummer, "*St. Luke*," p. 206 (cf. Thayer-Grimm, "*Lexicon of N.T.*" under *δικαιώω*) understands these words to have been uttered by Jesus, and in this context; and thus he interprets "the people admitted God's righteousness, in having appointed John's baptism, by being baptised," i.e., receiving the appointed baptism. But if the words are editorial, this interpretation is inadmissible; for then they are a comment upon Jesus' words which go before; i.e., the people acknowledge that they had done what God required of them in having been baptised by John. In the *Κοινή* the aorist was frequently used with a perfect sense; cf. Moulton,

"*Prolegomena*," pp. 141-146. This acknowledgment of God's righteousness is akin to the "Blessings" which, beginning with the famous  $\text{ברוך ה' אלהינו}$  have played an increasingly important part in synagogue worship, and in Jewish domestic life.

<sup>63</sup> Εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ of Mt. xxi. 31, should be compared with ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν of Mt. xi. 11 (where Lk. has τοῦ Θεοῦ). The Kingdom of the Heavens is a strictly eschatological conception, and was probably characteristic of Q; cf. "*Ox. Studies*," pp. 140, 141, 277. It was the Kingdom of the future; cp. Allen, "*St. Matthew*," pp. lxvii-lxxi. But the Kingdom of God is not eschatological; and in Mt. xxi. 31, it is the present moral relationship to God which the Baptist's preaching of righteousness makes possible. Undoubtedly it is preparatory to the other, which is thus in some sense already present; but it is distinct from it. In Mt. viii. 11, 12, we find that the Kingdom of the Heavens is thrown open to those of non-Abrahamic descent, while the Pharisee type is thrown out; presumably because it has not appropriated the Kingdom of God. With this compare the Baptist's denunciation of the "children of Abraham," Mt. iii. 9; and his opening of the Kingdom to the publicans, Lk. vii. 29. The  $\text{τελῶναι}$  were probably more hated for the fact that they symbolised a foreign despotism, than for their rapacity; with the  $\text{πόρνοι}$  they constituted the pariahs of society. It is interesting to notice their introduction in Lk. vii. 29; which has almost the force of "All the (common) people . . . even the publicans. . ."

<sup>65</sup> There can be no doubt that  $\text{βιάζεται}$  is Mid. in Lk. xvi. 16; cf. Thayer-Grimm, "*Lexicon*." In the  $\text{κοινὴ}$  the distinction between Mid. and Pass. in present and perfect was becoming obliterated; cf. Moulton, "*Prolegomena*," p. 163. There is good evidence for the passive use of this word in papyri and inscriptions; cf. "*Expositor*," 7th Series, vol. vi. p. 379. In Mt. xi. 12, the Mid. would make no sense; it must be passive. But it is surely a misunderstanding to interpret, "the Kingdom is violently treated in the persons

of its messengers"; in other words, the Kingdom is being persecuted by violent men, when the Baptist is imprisoned. For, though the words "in prison" may have been inserted to correspond with this view, we must remember that John was not of the Kingdom, according to Mt. xi. 11<sup>b</sup>, and therefore this was a misconception. Dalman is certainly wrong in saying that the idea of forcing the Kingdom is at variance with Jesus' teaching; for what is importunity in prayer but the forcing of the Kingdom? cf. however, on the verse, Dalman, "*Words of Jesus*," pp. 139-143; and Allen's note on those considered outcasts by orthodox Jews, who took possession of the Kingdom, "*St. Matthew*," p. 118. Lk. xvi. 16, marks a periodic progression; the Law and the Prophets until John: then the days of the Baptist; and then the preaching of the Gospel. This is obscured in Mt. by the dislocation and inversion of Mt. xi. 13 and 12. The days of the Baptist were the years of his ministry previous to the baptism of Jesus, when in strictness his ministry was closed. Such an expression could well be used during his life-time.

<sup>67</sup> In the first place τέκνων has good MS. authority in Mt. xi. 19, where ἔργων is probably a copyist's error. cf. "*Ox. Studies*," pp. 301, 302. Next, ἐδικαιώθη probably has a perfect sense; and ἀπό = ὑπό, as was common in the Κοινή, and expresses the agent. <sup>f</sup> Moulton, "*Prolegomena*," pp. 102, 237, 246. Σοφία can hardly be a personification of the Divine Wisdom, as Allen "*St. Matthew*" p. 119. This personification belongs to the Wisdom literature (cf. Job xxviii. 12, 20, 23; Prov. viii. 22-31; Eccles. xxiv.; Wisd. vii. viii.); but the speculations with which it was associated, presenting a prevailing Hellenic atmosphere, declined in interest before the tide of Legal and Apocalyptic thought; nor were they revived on Palestinian soil, but belong to the Alexandrinism of Philo, and to the Kabālā. cf. Toy, in *Ency. Bib.* vol. iv. cols. 5322-5336. Cheyne: "*Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*," Lectures iv. and v. There is no trace of this hypostatic conception in the N.T. Lk. xi. 49, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία



τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶπεν Ἀποστελῶ κ.τ.λ. is difficult. The words which follow belong to Jesus, and = Mt. xxiii. 34; but there is no evidence that "The Wisdom of God" was a designation of Jesus amongst the first Christians. Harnack's conjecture that it represents the title of a lost work is suggestive; cf. "*Ox. Studies*," pp. 162-164; but cp. Ryle, "*Canon of the O.T.*," pp. 165, 166. Plummer, "*St. Luke*," takes it in the general sense of God's Providence, which had sent forth Apostles and Prophets, and foresaw their doom. cf. p. 313. Σοφία is used in the N.T. in its classical sense of the intelligence which gathers knowledge by experience; cf. Mt. xii. 42; and so, discretion, Col. iv. 5; prudence, Ja. i. 5; also the acquisition by the same faculty of divine things, Mk. vi. 2; Eph. i. 8; also the same faculty attributed to God, Ro. xi. 33. It is used in a bad sense, of the worldly assumption of a wisdom opposed to the knowledge of the highest things, 1 Cor. i., *passim*; Col. ii. 23; and of a craftiness, or acuteness, which characterises this disposition, Ja. iii. 15; 2 Cor. i. 12 = *πανουργία* of iv. 2. cf. Thayer-Grimm, *op. cit.* The expression "children of wisdom" raises no particular difficulty; it was a common formula to express the qualities to be seen in certain persons. Thus "children of Jerusalem" (Gal. iv. 25) implied traits of citizenship; and we meet also with children of the Fathers (Ac. xiii. 33); of God (Jn. 1. 52; Ro. viii. 16, 21); of promise (Gal. iv. 28); of wrath (Eph. ii. 3); of light (Eph. v. 8); of the devil (1 Jn. iii. 10); of obedience (1 P. i. 14); of cursing (2 P. ii. 14). Thus, in this place, "children of wisdom" means those who displayed in their worldly character the fruits of the worldly wisdom they vaunted.—Δικαιόω in classical Greek means "to set right"—"to think right, or fit"—"to do right to another," i.e., justice—and in LXX only (cf. Ex. xxiii. 7; Jer. iii. 11), "to treat as right." cf. Liddle and Scott, "*Lexicon*." On the analogy of other verbs in —ώω, it should mean "to make δίκαιος;" but "this meaning is extremely rare, if not altogether doubtful." cf. Thayer-Grimm, "*Lexicon*." So Plummer, "*St. Luke*," p. 208; and Sanday and Headlam, "*Romans*," pp. 28-31, where

δικαίος and its cognates are fully discussed. The usual meanings in the N.T. are—"to exhibit, show one (τινὰ) to be righteous"—"to acknowledge to be righteous," i.e., pronounce righteous—and technically of God (esp. by Paul) "to judge" men righteous. The second sense is illustrated in Lk. xvi. 15, "Ye are they that claim to be righteous in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts, etc." But the meaning in this case must be determined by what the context tells us as to the identity of the "children of wisdom." There are three possibilities: (1) The "children of wisdom" are the followers of the Baptist and Jesus; thus we may paraphrase, "The Divine Wisdom, which planned the salvation of men by sending to them the Baptist and Jesus, has been vindicated (shown to be right) by those who, instead of passing adverse criticisms, became their disciples." So Allen, "*St. Matthew*," pp. 119, 120. The objection to this is that it does not sit at all closely to the context; and it personifies Wisdom, which appears to be incorrect. (2) The "children of wisdom" are the Baptist and Jesus themselves; thus "The wisdom of these two religious teachers, though the object of the cavil of their enemies, has nevertheless been proved to be right by the effectiveness of their work, or acknowledged to be so by their disciples." This comes nearer to the context, but is an involved manner of speaking. (3) The "children of wisdom" are the Pharisees in the audience; thus "The shallow wisdom of the critics has been vindicated by the use of epithets, borrowed from such wisdom's armoury!" This last interpretation has been adopted in the text.—For patristic uses of δικαιόω, see Suicer, "*Thesaurus*," vol. i. cols. 915-917.

<sup>69</sup> So Allen, "*St. Matthew*," p. 157. Swete, "*St. Mark*," p. 114, "miraculous powers are operative in him." cp. Lightfoot, "*Galatians*," p. 136; ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, "worketh miraculous powers in you." Dalman, "*Words of Jesus*," p. 201, thinks αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ rests upon a misunderstanding of an original Aramaic מְחַבְּדֵן בְּהַ גְּבוּרָתָא "mighty deeds are done by Him." But perhaps it is best understood to mean "possession." See Mt. xxiv. 29=Mk.

xiii. 25=Lk. xxi. 26, where αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is evidently **דְּוִשְׁתִּי מַלְאָךְ** of Is. xxxiv. 4, not the celestial bodies themselves, but the spirits which control them. Δυνάμεις are angels in Ro. viii. 38, 1 P. iii. 22; cf. Eph. iii. 10. ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. cp. *Eth. Enoch* lxi. 10, "He will call on all the host of the heavens and all the holy ones above, and the host of God . . . all the angels of power, and all the angels of principalities . . . and the other powers on the earth, over the water;" i.e., possession would involve miracle. Heb. vi. 5. δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος looks forward to the assimilation of the faithful to the life of Spirits. We may compare, Lk. v. 17, δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν, and Lk. xxiv. 49. ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσῃς ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν, for the miraculous power conveyed to Jesus and His disciples by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. And the account of Simon Magus provides us with the same idea in early Gnostic circles; Οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ Δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη Μεγάλη. Ac. viii. 10.

<sup>74</sup> See Edersheim, "*Life and Times*," vol. ii. App. viii. pp. 706-709. The most striking points of similarity between the Baptist and the Elijah may here be singled out. The *Targum-Pseudo-Jon.*, commenting on Ex. xxiii. 20, says that the Elijah will be the High-Priest of the Messianic reign, and will anoint the Messiah with oil. *Pirqé de R. Eliezer*, 29, referring to the tradition that Elijah restored the rite of circumcision, says that he will perform the initiatory rite of the Messianic Covenant. The same (43) says that his ministry will synchronise with a period of national repentance. *Yalkut*, vol. ii. p. 53, c, commenting on Is. lii. 7, says that Elijah must come immediately, i.e., three days, before Messiah. On the first day he will proclaim, "Peace cometh to the world;" on the second, "Good cometh to the world;" and on the third, "Salvation (i.e., **יְשׁוּעָה** = Ἰησοῦς) cometh to the world; saying unto Zion—Thy King cometh!" This last is very remarkable. The Elijah expectation is reflected in Justin Martyr, "*Dial. Tryph.*" xlix. Justin argues that,

in accordance with prophecy and the predictions of Jesus, Elijah would certainly come before the Great Day, which would be Christ's Second Advent. But Elijah had already come, in a sense, in the person of the Baptist. For the Spirit of God, Who dwells in the translated Elijah, came upon John (without leaving Elijah the forer), and made him the herald of Christ's first coming. Thus, as being endowed with his Spirit, John was in a real sense the Elijah. cf. viii, where Trypho says Χριστὸς δὲ, εἰ μὲν γεγένηται, καὶ ἔστι πον, ἄγνωστος ἔσται, καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς πω ἑαυτὸν ἐπίσταται, οὐδὲ ἔχει δυνάμιν τινα μέχρως ἂν ἐλθὼν Ἡλίας χρῆσθαι αὐτὸν, καὶ φανερὸν πᾶσι ποιῆσαι.

<sup>81</sup> Much of this section is indebted to Schweitzer, "*Quest of the Historical Jesus*," pp. 360-395. A brief summary of his constructive account of the Messianic consciousness, which has the great merit of providing an intelligible motive to the narrative, may therefore be desirable. The Messiah is a supernatural Person, who is expected to be revealed in the last times. The Baptist bases his preaching on Joel iii. iv., which speaks of an outpouring of the Spirit, with miraculous signs, as a prelude to the Day of the Lord. He pointed to a coming one, whose baptism will be accompanied by this outpouring of the Spirit. This coming one was the Elijah, and not the Messiah; for the Messiah was not expected to baptise. John's baptism was intended to be preparatory to the Elijah's, which would "seal" men against the incidence of Judgment; it would sanctify men for the reception of the Spirit. Jesus' identification of John with the Elijah, was due to His own Messianic consciousness; there was a sort of necessity in it; but it was imparted with secrecy, because it was wrapped up in His own Messiahship, which He desired to keep secret. Jesus realised that His Messiahship was a thing of the future; and He expected a *παρουσία* in which he would be revealed as Messiah. He judged it important to keep His Messiahship a secret from all, even the Baptist, until it should be declared at the *παρουσία*; and therefore he invariably speaks of the Kingdom in the language of *parable*. But He could not

preserve His secret. It was disclosed, without His will, at the Transfiguration (which we must place before the incident at Cæsarea Philippi), to three disciples, whom He sternly charged not to reveal it. But again it was betrayed. At Cæsarea Philippi, in answer to a casual question, Peter imprudently let the rest of the twelve into the secret; and they were strictly warned not to speak of it to anybody. Jesus had long realised that a *πειρασμός* must precede His *παρουσία*; the *πειρασμός* being equivalent to the Baptist's Day. But towards the end of His ministry, finding that the *πείρασμός* does not come, He begins to realise that the general Judgment is to be concentrated upon Himself; that He must die for His people; and so rise, to bring His Kingdom. Thus He attempts to force circumstances to His will, and to bring in His Messianic reign; and He goes up to Jerusalem to die. This necessity of His death is revealed to Him by His study of Isaiah's suffering Servant; language which He appropriates to Himself. The necessity of His death is no secret; and He provokes the Pharisees, cleanses the Temple, and so forth, to bring it about. But the Messianic secret He still preserves. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem is a conscious fulfilment of prophecy, and to Jesus Messianic; but not so to the crowds. They are in expectation of Elijah only, as is proved by their interpretation of Jesus' "Eli, Eli," on the Cross (N.B.—Should we not rather say that their suggestion of Elijah is a scoffing reference to what they had supposed to be His claim to be Elijah?) Thus they greet Him, on that ride, as Elijah—the "son of David" is an interpolation in the narrative, a Jewish-Christian colouring. Nobody suspects His secret. At the trials various charges are trumped up against Him, but are worthless for the purpose of His conviction. The claim to be Messiah is not made a count in His charge, because there are no witnesses to prove it. But at last the high-priest puts it in the form of a direct question, to which Jesus gives an unhesitating reply in the affirmative. The high-priest knew of this claim, because it formed the matter of Judas' treachery. The Council do not wish the secret, which at last is out, to become common property. But when they see that Pilate is

willing to release Jesus to please the crowd, who still regard Him as Elijah, they go about telling the people that He has in reality professed Himself Messiah; and so they induce them to shout for His crucifixion. Thus the Messianic secret becomes the common property of all.

<sup>82</sup> It seems that Lk. as well as Mt. is dependent upon Mk. in this passage, though they modify him independently. Some of Lk.'s peculiarities, especially verses 31 and 32, may be derived from a second source; cf. "*Ox. Studies*," pp. 322, 323; while Mt.'s are probably editorial, as is certainly verse 13. cf. Allen, "*St. Matthew*," pp. 185, 186. The Transfiguration is an Apocalyptic vision, in the approved style; its various features may be traced to the same hands which worked up the eschatological discourses of Jesus. Here Jesus, according to Mk., undergoes a metamorphosis; a crude statement which Mt. softens by introducing the explanation "his face did shine as the sun;" while Lk. modifies it by saying "the fashion of his countenance was altered" (cf. Dan. v. 6; *Slav. Enoch*, i. 7); and, in the manner of his account of the Baptism, he makes the change take place "as he was praying." The original suggestion is that Jesus assumed the semi-divine form of the super-human Messiah He would afterwards become. Lk.'s "there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elijah," involves a process of recognition (cf. Plummer, "*St. Luke*," p. 251), and suggests a hint of symbolical treatment of the forms. Lk. also tells us that they spoke of His "exodus" which He was to "fulfil" at Jerusalem; not, that is, of His death, but of His Messianic conquest over His enemies. To the account of Peter's suggestion to build three booths, Lk. prefaces the explanatory "as they were parting from him;" i.e. Peter made an attempt to detain the exponents of Law and Prophecy on an equality with Jesus, "not knowing what he said," i.e. not realising that they must pass away with the coming of the Messianic Kingdom. This implies matured reflection upon the meaning of the incident. For the belief that Moses would come with Elijah, see Allen, "*St. Matthew*," p. 184. For the cloud, which

enveloped the disciples also, Lk. ix. 34., cf. Swete, "St. Mark," p. 180. Such a cloud was usual in Theophanies, cf. Ex. xvi. 10; xix. 9, 16; xxiv. 15, 16; xxxiii. 9; Lev. xvi. 2; Num. xi. 25. The cloud was to appear in Messianic times, cf. 2 Macc. ii. 8; especially in connection with the παρουσία, cf. Mk. xiii. 26, cp. Dan. vii. 13; Mk. xiv. 62; Rev. i. 7. The *Bath Qol* utterances words similar to those at the Baptism; which suggests that Jesus may have declared at this time to the disciples the content of the Messianic consciousness which came to Him then. The appended "Hear ye him" recalls Deut. xviii. 15, which was not originally Messianic. The psychological details are reminiscent of the stupefaction and awe with which the three disciples must have listened to the disclosure. Lk. makes them "heavy with sleep," and only able to "remain awake" during the vision; (that διαγρηγορέω here means "to become fully awake" is only a conjecture). All three Gospels speak of the disciples' terror, and of the impulsive Peter's random speech. And Mark ix. 8, which we must punctuate καὶ ἐξάπινα, περιβλεψάμενοι, οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον κ.τ.λ. suggests the rapid melting away of the vision. But the Transfiguration has a substratum of fact, in the disclosure by Jesus of His Messianic secret, wrested from Him in some moment of spiritual exaltation, and accompanied by some unusual psychic phenomena. See Scott, "Kingdom and Messiah," p. 206. We must notice that the revelation of the Messiahship here, as at the later occasion of Cæsarea Philippi, is followed by the prediction of the passion, in order to make it clear that the Messiahship belongs to the future. The identification of the Baptist with Elijah, which follows, certainly preceded that of Mt. xi. 14; for in this declaration of the Messiahship we have very good ground for that identification; and the fact would hardly have been made common property before it was committed to the disciples. See further, Note 59.

<sup>85</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 5, 2. Τις δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἰδοῦναι ὀλωλέναι τὸν Ἡρώδου στρατὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ μάλα δικαίως τιννυμένου κατὰ ποινὴν Ἰωάννον τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Βαπτιστοῦ. κτείνει γὰρ τοῦτον Ἡρώδης,

ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους κελεύοντα, ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦντας, καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ χρωμένους, βαπτισμῷ συνίεναι. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανείσθαι, μὴ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμαρτάνων παραιτήσῃ χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἀγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνῃ προεκεκαθαυμένης. καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συστρεφομένων, καὶ γὰρ ἤρδησαν ἐπὶ πλείστον τῇ ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων, δείσας Ἡρώδῃ τὸ ἐπὶ τοιούτῳ πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φέροι, πάντα γὰρ ἐψέκσαν συμθυλῇ τῇ ἐκείνου παράζοντες, πολὺ κρείττον ἡγείσθαι, πρὶν τι νέωτερον ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, προλαβὼν ἀναιρεῖν, ἢ μηταβολῆς γενομένης εἰς τὰ παράγματα ἔμπροσθεν μετανοεῖν. καὶ ὁ μὲν, ὑποψία τῇ Ἡρώδου, δέσμιος εἰς τὸν Μαχαίρουντα πεμφθεὶς, τὸ προειρημένον φρούριον, ταύτῃ κτίννυται τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις δόξαν ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ τῇ ἐκείνου τὸν ὕλεθρον ἐπὶ τῷ στρατεύματι γενέσθαι, τοῦ Θεοῦ κακῶς Ἡρώδῃ θέλοντος.

93\* The "justice towards each other, and piety towards God" recalls the "fruits worthy of repentance," which, in both cases, must precede baptism. The non-sacramental character of his baptism, which prepares the "body" for a further gift, and witnesses to a changed mind, is in full accord with the Synoptic estimate. *Βαπτισμῷ συνίεναι* may, however, be original; and it may point to a phase, perhaps the last, when John collected large, and more or less organised, crowds, to Aïnon ('Ain Kārim, near Jerusalem), preparatory to some important move. *Ὑποψία τῇ Ἡρώδου* does not weaken the force of what goes before; there was ample justification for his suspicion; but he may have acted too precipitately, and therefore injudiciously.

94 Machærus appears to have been a stronghold very highly fortified, and rendered almost impregnable by great natural advantages. cf. Josephus, *B.J.* vii. 6, 1. See also Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. ii. p. 250, note 131. Josephus tells us that Herod's first wife fled to Machærus previous to her divorce, and that the place was then in the hands of Aretas. Is this reliable? or is not the text corrupted? The passage runs as follows:—*Ἡ γυνή,*



πίστεως αὐτῇ τῶν πρὸς τὴν Ἑρῳδιάδα συνθηκῶν γενομένης, πρὶν ἐκπυστος αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τὰ πάντα ἐκμαθούσα, κελεύει πέμπειν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ Μαχαιροῦντος· μεθόριον δέ ἐστι τῆς τε Ἀρέτα καὶ Ἑρώδου ἀρχῆς· γνώμην οὐκ ἐκφαίνουσα τὴν ἑαυτῆς. καὶ Ἑρώδης ἐξέπεμπε, μηδὲν ἡσθῆσθαι τὴν ἀνδρωπον προσδοκῶν. ἡ δὲ, προαπεστάλκει γὰρ ἐκ πλείονος εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροῦντα, τότε πατρὶ αὐτῆς ὑποτελῇ, πάντων εἰς τὴν ὁδοιπορίαν ἡτοιμασμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Ἀρέτα παρῆν, καὶ ἀφορμᾶται εἰς τὴν Ἀραβίαν κομιδῇ τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐκ διαδοχῆς, παρῆν τε ὡς τὸν πατέρα ἢ τάχος, καὶ αὐτῷ τὴν Ἑρώδου διάνοιαν ἔφραζε.—*Ant.* xviii. 5, 1. If Machærus was then in the possession of Aretas, when did Antipas recover it? It could not have been in his subsequent war with that King, in A.D. 34, for that is a later date than can be assigned to the death of the Baptist. Nor is it likely that Aretas would have relinquished it at an earlier date, in obedience to the bidding of Tiberius, for Antipas would hardly then have chosen it as a fitting place for the imprisonment of a political offender. Nor does it seem possible that, had Machærus belonged to Aretas, Antipas would have sanctioned his wife's retreat to that place; for Josephus is not conscious that Antipas in reality abetted her flight to her father. cf. Schürer, *H. J. P.* I. ii. p. 23, note 20. G. A. Smith, "*Hist. Geog.*" pp. 569, 579. Machærus was probably never in Aretas' possession.

<sup>98</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 5, 4. Ἑρῳδιάς δὲ αὐτῶν ἡ ἀδελφὴ γήμεται Ἑρώδῃ Ἑρώδου τοῦ μεγάλου παιδί, θς γέγονεν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς τοῦ Σίμωνος τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ αὐτοῖς Σαλώμῃ γιγνέται, μεθ' ἧς τὰς γονὰς Ἑρῳδιάς, ἐπὶ συγχύσει φρονήσασα τῶν πατρῶν, Ἑρώδῃ γαμεῖται τοῦ ἀνδρός τῷ ὁμοπατρίῳ ἀδελφῷ, διαστᾶσα ζώντος. τὴν δὲ Φαλιλαίων τετραρχίαν εἶχεν οὗτος. ἡ δὲ θυγάτηρ αὐτῆς Σαλώμῃ Φιλίππῳ γαμεῖται, Ἑρώδου παιδί, ὃν τετραρχῇ τε Τραχωνίτιδος. καὶ ἄπαιδος τελευτήσαντος, Ἀριστόβουλος αὐτὴν ἄγεται, Ἑρώδου παῖς τοῦ Ἀγρίππου ἀδελφοῦ. παῖδες δὲ ἐγένοντο αὐτοῖς τρεῖς, Ἑρώδης, Ἀγρίππας, Ἀριστόβουλος.

<sup>99</sup> Probably the αὐτοῦ of W.H. in Mk. vi. 22 must yield to αὐτῆς. In this case, the pronoun would serve

to emphasise the fact that Herodias, in order to gain her ends by a trick, was content to degrade her own daughter to the position of an *ἐράστρα*—a proposal as unlikely as it would be disgraceful. The story is probably modelled upon that of Esther; cf. Esth. i. 10, 11; ii. 9; v. 3. 4. A way out of the perplexity has been suggested by Gutschmid, which runs as follows:—Philip came to the reins of government in B.C. 4; therefore he was probably born about B.C. 25. He died in A.D. 34, a man of 58 years of age. There may have been a very great disparity in years between himself and Salome. Aristobulus, Salome's second husband, may well have been born about A.D. 8; and since Salome bore him three children, there was probably no great difference in their ages. Say that Salome was born in A.D. 10. Then, if we take A.D. 28 as the year of the Baptist's death, Salome might easily have danced then as a girl of 18, and still a *κοράσιον*. Her wedding with Philip might have fallen in the following year, when she was 19 and he 54. And, supposing her to have married Aristobulus in A.D. 36, two years subsequently to Philip's death, then she would have been 26 years old, to his 28. cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. ii. p. 28, note 29. But such a harmonistic arrangement is, after all, no more than a tissue of unverifiable assumptions.\*

<sup>103</sup> The prepositional element in *συντηρεῖν* gives the word a "perfectivising" sense; a continuous process of watching, to preserve. cf. Moulton, "*Prolegomena*," pp. 113, 116, and "*Expositor*," 8th series. vol. 2. p. 280. Lk. iii. 19, has it that John rebuked Herod, not only for the matter of Herodias, but "for all the evil things which Herod had done." When he goes on to say that John's imprisonment (on Herodias' initiative) was an addition to these evils, we may take it that the former evil things were what he had done at his wife's instigation. In other words, the attack throughout was upon, not Herod so much as Herodias.

<sup>108</sup> Luke has evidently been at great pains to fix the date accurately, and there is no reason to question his verdict. The years of Tiberius' reign probably date

from the death of Augustus, on 19th Aug., 14 A.D. Thus the 15th year would be 19th Aug., A.D. 28—18th Aug., A.D. 29. Pilate was procurator of Judæa, A.D. 26-36; Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee, B.C. 4—A.D. 39; Philip, Tetrarch of Ituræa, B.C. 4—A.D. 34; Lysanias, Tetrarch of Abilene, ? —A.D. 37 (cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.* I. ii. pp. 337, 338); Annas, High-Priest, A.D. 6—15; Caiaphas, A.D. 18—36; Annas continuing leader of the Synedrium during his son-in-law's period of office. If this period of the Baptist's ministry commenced in the autumn of A.D. 28, then the baptism of Jesus may have fallen in connection with the Passover, in the spring of 29. The Baptist's imprisonment and execution would then have followed in the summer of the same year. And if, as seems very probable, the ministry of Jesus lasted no more than one year, the Crucifixion would have fallen in the Passover of A.D. 30. The Nativity of Jesus is more difficult to date. Lk. ii. 2 does not help us, for Quirinius cannot be placed where Luke would place him; the evangelist has probably mistaken the census for that of A.D. 7, when Quirinius was governor. cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xvii. 13, 5; xviii. 1, 1. That such a census was not an impossibility, however, has been proved by an edict of G. Vibius Maximus, Governor of Egypt, 104 A.D., printed in Milligan, "*Greek Papyri*," pp. 72, 73. cf. Deissman, "*Light from the Ancient East*," pp. 268, 269. The evidence of Matthew would seem to place the Nativity as early as A.D. 7. This does not conflict with Lk. iii. 23, which is no more than a manner of stating that Jesus had reached full manhood. cp. Jn. viii. 57; cf. Num. iv. 3, 39; viii. 24, 25. "*Pirqe Aboth*," v. 24, "at thirty for entering into one's full strength." In the "*Zadokite*" document it is directed that the Priest must be between thirty and sixty years of age, the Censor between thirty and fifty, and the Judges between twenty-five and sixty. cf. p. 14; ll. 7, 9; p. 10, l. 7. See on the whole question, Turner, in Hastings' "*Dict. Bib.*" vol. i. pp. 403-415; von Soden, in *Encyc. Bib.* vol. i. cols. 801-809; Gore, "*Dissertations*," pp. 19-21.

113 cf. 2 Kings i. 8. Τρίχες is equivalent to שער Probably not a hair cloth, but a skin with the hair still upon it. For ἀκρίδες, cf. Cheyne in *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii. col. 2136. It might mean locusts, which were ceremonially clean for food; Lev. xi. 22; but more probably represents קרובי caruba beans, pods of the locust tree (*ceratonia siliqua*). These beans were the ordinary food of the poorest folk. Such food signified humility: "Israel needs caruba pods to do repentance."—*Wayyikaā R.* 35. And a preacher of repentance would have shown humility. Locusts would have hardly been so plentiful in the desert as to have always served John for food. And קרובי might easily have been mistaken for קנבא or קרגלא.

117 This tendency to depreciate the importance, and independent mission, of the Baptist, leads many patristic writers to draw a distinction between the Λόγος and the φωνή of Jn. i. 1, 14, 23; which, they suggest, is a contrast designed by the author to represent the true relation of Jesus and John, in opposition to those who were disposed to make too large claims for the Baptist. The opposition is founded upon the distinction in classical writers, where λόγος is equivalent to rational, articulate speech, and φωνή often to the unintelligible cry of an animal, or the sound of an inanimate object. Thus in Ignatius, "*Ep. Rom.*" 2, 'Εὰν γὰρ σιωπήσητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐγὼ Λόγος Θεοῦ· ἐὰν δὲ ἐρασθήτε τῆς σαρκὸς μου, πάλιν ἔσομαι φωνή.—"If ye be silent and leave me alone, I am a word of God; but if ye desire my flesh, then shall I be again a mere cry." In other words, if Ignatius is allowed to die, then the witness he has always borne to Jesus will become intelligible and effective; but if his life is preserved, then that life will be fruitless and meaningless. See Lightfoot, "*Apostolic Fathers*," Pt. ii. vol. ii. pp. 198, 200. So Jesus is the Λόγος, because He is fully conscious of the part He is playing in the Divine economy of human redemption; but John is only the φωνή, because he is merely a witness to Jesus, a sort of unconscious piece of mechanism, with no clearly defined and articulated message of his own. • A word

should be given to Jn. v. 33, 34<sup>a</sup>, 35, 36<sup>a</sup>, ὅμοιως ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τῇ μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω . . . ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καίμενος καὶ φαίνων, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠδελήσατε ἀγαλλιασθῆναι πρὸς ὥραν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ· ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου. The fourth evangelist is here putting his case very strongly. Hitherto he has been content to admit that John played a necessary part in the Messianic coming; that of witnessing to the person of the Messiah. Now, while recalling the fact that John did indeed witness to the truth, he points out that the witness was essentially unimportant, almost superfluous; since the works that Jesus did were a far greater proof, a convincing proof, of His Divine character and mission. This carries the process of belittling John a step further, and we could not have a better instance of the polemical nature of the author's work. At the same time he allows, as he was bound to do, the effective influence which John wielded; "he was the lamp that burneth and shineth," though "he was not the light," i. e. i. e. whatever power he possessed, he derived from Him to Whom he witnessed; John is the lamp in which the light burns; and it was this borrowed glory which gave him his temporary popularity. But the author goes on, "ye were willing to rejoice for a season in his light"; implying that, when the Light itself had dawned, then men forsook the company of the lamp. He is reading a lesson to the Baptists; instructing them to fall into line with what had been the historical process of the past.

132 The following exhibits to some extent the sort of indebtedness of the Lord's Prayer to extraneous sources. (1.) "Our Father which art in heaven." In a Jewish prayer, which may, however, be modelled on the Christian, "Our Father who art in heaven"; cf. Singer, "*Jewish Prayer Book*," p. 9. On the expression, see Dalman, "*Words*," pp. 184-192. (2.) "Hallowed be Thy name." In the *Kaddish*, "Magnified and sanctified be his great name." cf. Singer, p. 37. (3.) "Thy Kingdom come." In the *Kaddish*, "May he establish

his Kingdom during your life." cf. Singer, p. 37. (4.) "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth." See *Bērākhōth*, 16<sup>b</sup>, "May it be thy will, O Lord our God, to make peace in the family above and in the family below"; and 29<sup>b</sup>, "Do thy will in heaven above." (5.) "Give us this day (day by day, Lk.) our bread for the morrow (or, for subsistence, ἐπιούσιος)." cf. *Sōtā* 48<sup>b</sup>. "Whoever has a bit of bread in his basket and says, What shall I eat to-morrow? must be reckoned among those of little faith." This is an interesting parallel to Mt. vi. 25-34; and suggests that it would be out of place to interpret the clause of the next day's food. (6.) "And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors." A saying, too long to quote, of R. Akiba, in *Pirke Aboth*. iii. 20, cf. Singer, p. 194, illustrates the commercial standard of guilt in this clause. It is usually supposed that ὀφειλήματα is more authentic than Lk.'s ἁμαρτίαι; but Dalman, p. 281, points out that it would in any case have to be rendered by the Aramaic חַוְוָה which might well be translated by "sins." (7.) "And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one." See Singer, p. 7. "O lead us not into the power of sin, or of transgression or iniquity, or of temptation, or of scorn." *Bērākhōth*, 16<sup>b</sup>, "and from Satan the Destroyer." The liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer fully accounts for the doxology; we find it, for instance, in the *Didachē*, viii. 3. It is interesting to notice the semi-magical use of the Lord's Prayer, found upon a Christian amulet of the 6th cent. cf. Milligan, "*Greek Papyri*," pp. 132-134. For the whole subject, cf. Taylor, "*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*," pp. 124-130, 176-178; Nestle, in *Ency. Bib.* vol. iii. cols. 2816-2823; Cheyne, *do.*, col. 3829; Plummer, in *Hastings' Dict. Bib.* vol. iii. pp. 141-144; Votaw, *do.*, Extra vol. pp. 32-38; Plummer, "*St. Luke*," pp. 293-298; Allen, "*St. Matthew*," pp. 58-60; Schürer, *H.J.P. II.*, ii. pp. 83-89, for the *Shēma* and *Shēmōnēh 'Ešreh*; Dalman, "*Messianische Texte*," for the originals; and Schwab's translation of "*Bērākhōth*." The Syriac prayer attributed to the Baptist, quoted by Nestle, is clearly apocryphal.

133 The Lord's Prayer was, in all probability, eschatological in its original setting. This comes out most clearly in the 5th and 7th clauses. Ἐπιούσιος may be compounded of ἐπί + οὐσία; = (our bread) for subsistence; or ἐπί + ἔναι; = (our bread) for the coming (day). If the latter is correct, the reference is probably, not to the morrow, but to the day of the inauguration of the Kingdom, and the banquet which, in the apocalyptic literature, is a common feature of that occasion. This banquet finds a place in Jesus' teaching; cf. Lk. xxii. 29, 30. "I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The food to be partaken at that banquet, according to one Jewish legend, was Leviathan; Ps. lxxiv. 14. cf. Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.* pp. 252, 399. The Passover looked back to the Exodus, and forward to the Messianic banquet. But in the "*Apocalypse of Baruch*," xxix. 8, the food is said to be the Manna, which had been rapt to heaven, and there treasured up for the occasion; "it will come to pass at that self-same time that the treasury of manna will again descend from on high, and they will eat of it in those years." See also, "*Sybilline Oracles*," vii. 149. Ἄλλ' ἅμα πάντες Μάννην τὴν δροσερὴν λευκοῖσιν ὁδοῦσι φάγονται. cf. Rev. ii. 17, "the hidden manna." See Swete: "*Apocalypse*." In Ps. lxxviii. 25, manna is called "angels' food"; and in Ps. cv. 40, "the bread of heaven." cf. Neh. ix. 15; 4 Ezra, i. 19; Wisd. xvi. 20: xix. 21<sup>b</sup>, "the ice-like grains of ambrosial food." Paul, in 1 Cor. x. 3, has, they "did all eat the same spiritual meat"; in John vi. 32, 35, we have, "It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread out of heaven . . . I am the bread of life." And, finally, we have the institution of the sacrament; "This is my body . . . this is my blood . . . I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom." Mt. xxvi. 26-29. In other words, Jesus taught His disciples to pray for the coming Banquet, as they prayed for the coming

Kingdom (reading, as is likely, τὸν ἄρον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου); and Christian thought, basing itself upon the manna as the substance of the feast, interpreted it as the heavenly body of the Christ, of which it is possible to participate sacramentally even here and now. cf. Taylor, "*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*," pp. 178-192.—It was the common anticipation that the Messianic age would be introduced by a sort of birth-pangs. cf. Mt. xxiv. 8. "All these things are the beginning of travail." cp. Zech. xiv. 6-9; Dan. xii. 1. "A time of trouble." 4 Ez. v. 1-12; vi. 24; xiii. 29-32. *Eth. Enoch*, xcix. 4-9. *Apoc. Bar.* xxvii. 1-13. This πειρασμός is in view in the following passages, which were inspired by a sense of impending catastrophe in the coming End. Lk. xxii. 40, "Pray that ye enter not into the temptation." Ja. i. 2, "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations." Ja. i. 12, "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation." 1 P. i. 6, "Ye have been put to grief in manifold temptations." 2 P. ii. 9, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation." Rev. iii. 10, "I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, that hour which is to come upon the whole world, to tempt them that dwell upon the earth." cp. Lk. xxi. 36; xxii. 28. In all these cases it is not moral evil, but a trial of faith, which is in view. And the eschatological discourses in the Synoptists develop the theme. Connected with this "fiery trial of faith" is a person, or spirit, of apostasy and hostility to God; the πονήρως, who is viewed under various guises, but whose business it is to test the faith of the elect. Mt. xxiv. 24, "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect." 1 Jn. ii. 18, "As ye heard that antichrist cometh, even now have there arisen many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last hour." 1 Jn. ii. 22, "This is the antichrist, he that denieth the Father and the Son." 2 Thess. ii. 3-12, "The man of lawlessness." cf. Kennedy, "*St. Paul's Conceptions*," pp. 207-221.



<sup>138</sup> cf. Ignatius, *Ep. Ephes.* xviii. Ὅς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθάρσῃ; and see the note in Lightfoot, "*Apost. Fathers*," Part. ii. vol. ii. pp. 75, 76. In the first prayer of the Baptismal Liturgy we read "by the baptism of thy well-beloved son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin." But, in that immediately preceding the Baptism, "whose dearly beloved son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of his most precious side both water and blood; and gave commandment to his disciples, that they should . . . baptise . . . Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin." It was the death of Jesus, and not His baptism, which really gave the purifying, and Spirit-bearing, effect to the water of baptism. cp. 1 Jn. v. 6. cf. "*Ep. of Barnabas*," v. Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὑπέμεινεν ὁ κύριος παραδόναι τὴν σάρκα εἰς καταφθοράν, ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀγνισθῶμεν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ραντίσματος αὐτοῦ. "*Apost. Const.*" v. 6. Of an unbaptised martyr; Τὸ γὰρ πάθος τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ ἔσται αὐτῷ γνησιώτερον βάπτισμα· ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν πείρα συναποθνήσκει τῷ Κυρίῳ, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τύπῳ.

<sup>147</sup> cf. *Slav. Enoch*, xxx. 15. "And I gave him his will, and showed him the two ways, the light and the darkness. And I said unto him: 'This is good and this is evil'; that I should know whether he has love for Me or hate." cf. note in loc. in ed. by Morfill and Charles. cf. Jer. xxi. 8; Deut. xxx. 15; Eccles. xv. 17; xvii. 6; Mt. vii. 13, 14; 2 P. ii. 2. Also *Didachè*, ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶ, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου. i. 1. cf. ed. by Spence, pp. 82-84. Wordsworth, "*Ministry of Grace*," pp. 16-18. cp. *Ep. of Barnabas*, xviii. Ὅδοι δύο εἰσὶν διδαχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἥ τε τοῦ φωτός καὶ ἡ τοῦ σκότους. *Pastor of Hermas*, Mand. vi. 1, 2. *Clement. Hom.* vii. 7; *Apost. Const.* vii. 1-19. Mt. xxi. 32. John's "way of righteousness." cf. Allen, "*St. Matthew*," pp. 227, 228. This may well be the "way" in which Apollos was instructed. Paul, replying to Tertullus, claims for himself, "after the Way which they call a Heresy, so serve I the God of our

fathers, believing all things which are according to the law, and which are written in the prophets." Ac. xxiv. 14. By which he means to imply that the Christianity of his "sect," unlike the teaching of Pharisees or Sadducees, is in full sympathy with the more primitive Hebrew religion. In Ac. ix. 2 we have a reference to the "Way," as a term applied to certain Christians in Damascus. Perhaps the term was appropriated by the Zadokite sect of Judaizers, of whom we shall presently have to speak. See Rackham, "*Acts*," pp. 129, 130, 76. Jesus had called Himself the "Way."

<sup>149</sup> Adopting the exposition of Baldensperger; cf. *Ency. Bib.* vol. i. col. 264. cp. Lk. xxiv. 27, τὰ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ. It is, of course, possible that this passage has been interpolated, and that verses 25<sup>o</sup>, 26<sup>bo</sup>, 28, do not belong to the original. Obviously the incident has been introduced to give an historical setting to 1 Corinthians; but it is not easy to reconcile it with the evidence of the epistle. In 1 Cor. iii. 6, Apollos is represented as carrying on Paul's work, on the same lines; while in 1 Cor. i. 10-12, he is the leader of a faction. No doubt this was unintentional on his part; but it was probably based upon some difference in teaching. Perhaps, since he came from Alexandria, he may have indulged in that characteristic allegorizing of Scripture for which Paul had little fondness; and he may, in this, have been the author of that "wisdom" against which Paul inveighs, in 1 Cor. i. 17—iii. 4. While Paul chiefly devoted himself to the Gentiles at Corinth, Apollos seems to have approached the Jews; 1 Cor. xii. 2; Ac. xix. 28. But there was no personal friction between the two. 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

<sup>156</sup> Epiphanius, "*Ad. Haeres*," I. xvii. Ταύταις δὲ συνέπειται τις αἵρεσις Ἡμεροβαπτιστῶν, οὕτω καλουμένη, μηδὲν μὲν παραλλάττουσα τῶν ἄλλων, ἀλλ' ἴσα τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων φρονοῦσα. οὐ μὴν ἐξισουμένη τοῖς Σαδδουκαίοις ἐν τῇ τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναστάσει μόνον, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις. τοῦτο δὲ περιττὸν αὐτῇ κέκτημένη ἢ αἵρεσις, ὥς ἐν ἑαυρὶ τε καὶ μετοπώρῳ, χειμῶνι

τε καὶ θέρει πάντοτε καθημέραν βαπτίζεσθαι, ὅθεν καὶ Ἡμεροβαπτιστὴν εἵληφε τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν. ἔφασκε γὰρ αὕτη ἄλλως πῶς μὴ εἶναι ζῆν ἀνθρώπῳ, εἰ μὴ τι ἄρα καὶ ἑκάστην ἡμέραν βαπτίζοιτο τις ἐν ὕδατι, ἀπολουόμενός τε καὶ ἀγνιζόμενος ἀπὸ πάσης αἰτίας.

163 Epiphanius, "Ad. Hær." I. xiv. Δοσιθέοι δὲ τούτοις διαφέρονται κατὰ πολλοὺς τοῖς τρόποις. ἀνάστασιν γὰρ ὁμολογοῦσι, καὶ πολιτεῖαι παρ' αὐτοῖς εἰσὶν. ἐμφύχων ἀπέχονται, ἄλλα καὶ τίνες αὐτῶν ἐγκρατεύονται ἀπὸ γάμων μετὰ τὸ βιώσαι, ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ παρθενεύουσιν. ὡσαύτως μὲν περιτομὴν τε καὶ Σάββατον, καὶ τὸ μὴ διγγάνειν τινὸς διὰ τὸ βδελύττεσθαι πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ὁμοίως ἔχουσι. νηστείας δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς φυλάττειν καὶ ἐξασκεῖσθαι εἰσάγει ὁ λόγος. ἡ δὲ πρόφασις τοῦ τὸν Δοσίθεον φρονῆσαι ταῦτα, αὕτη. οὗτος συνεμίγη ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων ὁρμώμενος εἰς τὰ τῶν Σαμάρειτων ἔδνη, καὶ ἐν παιδεύσει κατὰ τὸν νόμον προήκων, δευτερώσεσί τε τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς, θηρώμενος τὰ πρωτεῖα καὶ ἀποτυχῶν, καὶ μὴ ἀξιωθεὶς τι παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις νομισθῆναι, ἐξέκλινεν εἰς τὸ Σαμαρειτικὸν γένος, καὶ ταύτην τὴν αἵρεσιν προεστήσατο.

166 *Clementine Recognitions*, ii. 7. Of Simon, a Samaritan of Gettores: "Gloriæ ac jactantiæ supra omne genus hominum cupidus, ita ut excelsam Virtutem, quæ supra creatorem Deum sit, credi se velit, et Christum putari, atque Stantem nominari. Hac autem appellatione utitur, quasi qui neget posse se aliquando dissolvi." [Is Ἑστώς Messianic? i.e. =  $\text{יהוה}$ , derived from  $\text{יה}$ , which is probably equivalent to  $\text{נש}$ , "to stand." cf. Baudissin in Hastings' *D.B.* vol. iv. p. 67.] ii. 8. "Interfecto etenim, . . . Baptista Johanne, cum Dositheus Hæreseos suæ inisset exordium, cum aliis triginta principalibus discipulis, etc." ii. 11. "Verum Dositheus, ubi sibi derogari sensit a Simone, verens ne opinio sua obscuraretur apud homines, qui eum putabant, ipsum esse Stantem, furore commotus etc." *Clementine Homilies*, ii. 22. Of Simon, who had studied at Alexandria: Ἐνίστο δὲ καὶ Χριστὸν ἑαυτὸν αἰνισσόμενος, ἐστῶτα προσαγορεύει. ταύτη δὲ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ κέχρηται, ὥς δὴ στησόμενος αἰεὶ, καὶ αἰτίαν

φθορᾶς, τὸ σῶμα πεσεῖν, οὐκ ἔχων. ii. 23, 24. Ἰωάννης τις ἐγένετο ἡμερόβαπτιστῆς, ὃς καὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ . . . ἐγενετο πρόδος . . . ὡσαύτως καὶ αὐτῷ ἔξαρχοι ἄνδρες γεγόνασιν τριάκοντα . . . τούτων δὲ τῶν τριάκοντα, τῷ Ἰωάννῃ πρῶτος καὶ δοκιμώτατος ἦν ὁ Σίμων· ὃς, καὶ τοῦ μὴ ἄρξαι αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν τελευταίαν τοῦ Ἰωάννου, αἰτίαν ἔσχευ ταύτην. Ἀποδημῶντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς μαγείας ἐπάσκησιν, τοῦ Ἰωάννου ἀναιρεθέντος, Δωσίθεός τε τῆς ἀρχῆς ὀρεγομενος, θάνατον αὐτοῦ ψευδῇ καταγγείλας, διαδέχεται τὴν αἵρεσιν.

<sup>169</sup> cf. *Clement. Recog.* i. 54. "Scribae quoque et Pharisei in aliud schisma deducuntur: sed hi baptizati a Johanne, et velut clavem regni cœlorum, verbum veritatis tenentes, ex Moysis traditione susceptum; occultârunt ab auribus populi. Sed et ex discipulis Johannis, qui videbantur esse magni, segregârunt se a populo, et magistrum suum veluti Christum prædicârunt." i. 60. "Et ecce unus ex discipulis Johannis adfirmabat, Christum Johannem fuisse, et non Jesum: in tantum, inquit, ut et ipse Jesus omnibus hominibus et Prophetis majorem esse pronuntiaverit Johannem. Si ergo, inquit, major est omnibus, sine dubio et Moyse et ipso Jesu major habendus est. Quod si omnium major est, ipse est Christus. Ad hæc Cananaeus Simon respondens adseruit Johannem majorem quidem fuisse omnibus Prophetis, et omnibus qui sunt filii mulierum; non tamen majorem esse filio hominis: et ideo Jesus quidem, et Christus est; Johannes vero, solum Prophetæ; et tantum interest inter ipsum et Jesum, quantum inter præcursorem, et eum cui præcurritur; et quantum inter eum qui legem dat, et eum qui legem servat." i. 63. (We persuaded) "discipulos Johannis, ne scandalum paterentur in Johanne." Justin Martyr, in the *Dial. Tryph.* xxxv. and lxxxii., gives a list of πολλοὶ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοάποστολοι who confess Jesus in a manner, and call themselves Christians, but who deny worship to Him; such as the Marcians, Valentinians, Basilidians, and Saturnilians; but in lxxx, speaking of these so-called Christian sects,

he instances the Baptists amongst Jewish heretical bodies : *μη ὑπολάβητε αὐτοὺς Χριστιανούς· ὡς περ οὐδὲ Ἰουδαίους, ἃν τις ὁρθῶς ἐξετάσῃ, ὁμολογήσειεν εἶναι τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, ἢ τὰς ὁμοίας αἵρέσεις Γενιστῶν, καὶ Μεριστῶν, καὶ Γαλιλαίων, καὶ Ἑλληνιανῶν, καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ Βαπτιστῶν.* In lxxxviii, there is a distinct reference to the claim that John was the Messiah : *Ἰωάννου γὰρ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ κηρύσσοντος βάπτισμα μετανοίας . . . οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑπελάμβανον αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν· πρὸς οὗς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβόα, οὐκ εἰμι ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος. κ.τ.λ.* It is possible to see a reference also in xxix, *τίς ἐκείνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος χρεῖα ἀγίῳ πνεύματι βεβαπτισμένῳ ;* though the "other baptism" may be a synonym for circumcision.

<sup>174</sup> In the "Zadokite" document, the title *בני צדק* is claimed for the sectaries in fulfilment of Ez. xlv. 15. cf. p. 4, ll. 1-3; and they are addressed as "ye that know righteousness," cf. p. 1, l. 1. On p. 5, ll. 2-5, we read, "As to the prince it is written 'He shall not multiply wives unto himself.' But David read not in the Book of the Law that was sealed, which was in the Ark. For it was not opened in Israel from the day of the death of Eleazar and Joshua, and the elders who worshipped Ashtareth. And it was hidden and was not discovered until Zadok arose." This Zadok was, obviously, neither the priest of David's reign, nor the founder of the Sadducean party, mentioned in *Pirqe Aboth*, iv. 7; but an unknown Zadok who lived somewhere between David and Ezekiel. Possibly the name is a mistake for Hilkiyah. cf. 2 K. x. xii.

<sup>175</sup> cf. p. 14, l. 8, for reference to the *Torah*. See also p. 7, l. 7. The document shows traces of indebtedness to the "*Book of Jubilees*," the "*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*," and the "*Book of Enoch*." cf. Schechter, *op. cit.* pp. xxvi-xxix for the sectarian origin of the *pseudepigrapha*. For the Boëthusians, cf. Taylor, "*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*," pp. 112, 113. Boëthos and Zadok were, according to Rabbi Nathan, disciples of Antigonus of Soko. But Schürer, *H.J.P.* II. ii. p. 32, note 80, refers to "*Menachoth*," x. 3,

where the Boëthusians are said to derive their name from the High-priestly family in the time of Herod the Great. Boëthos, according to Josephus, *Ant.* xv. 9, 3, was the father of Simon whom Herod raised to the High-priesthood before marrying his daughter Mariamne ii. Several members of the family subsequently became High-priest; cf. Schürer, *H.J.P.* II. i. pp. 197-204. Margoliouth refers to the "*Jewish Encyclopædia*," vol. iii. p. 285.

177 It seems very probable that Jesus is the "Teacher of Righteousness" who figures in the document. cf. p. i. l. 11. "He raised for them a Teacher of Righteousness, to make them walk in the way of His heart." p. 2, l. 12. "And He made them know His Holy Spirit through His Messiah, and He is true;" where Jesus' Messiahship is acknowledged. On p. 1, ll. 20, 21, we have a vivid presentation of the Passion; for we are told that the people of Israel "justified the wicked one," that is Barabbas, "and condemned the righteous one," namely Jesus (cp. p. iv. l. 7), "and transgressed the covenant, and turned the statute to naught," a reference to the illegalities of the so-called trials; "and trooped themselves together against the life of the righteous one . . . and they goaded the people to hostility," a sentence with which we may compare Mt. xxvii. 20, "Now the chief priests and the elders persuaded the multitudes that they should ask for Barabbas, and destroy Jesus." In p. 2, l. 13, we read "in the explanation of His name are their names." "Jesus" means "Yahwè our deliverance"; and βοηθός means "helper." In other words, the converted Boëthusians liked to think of themselves as Jesuits. cf. *Clement. Hom.* i. 19. Τὸν μὲν οὖν βοηθὸν ἄνδρα, τὴν ἀληθὴν προφήτην λέγω, where we may have a reference to this Jesuit appellation. But it is singular that these "righteous" people should have rejected the term "Christian;" and possibly they did so of set purpose." In Ac. xi. 26 we read "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." No doubt this name had its origin in a punning sneer of their enemies, i.e. "Chrēstians"—the

worthy, pious folk; Puritans, or Assidæans. cf. Justin Martyr, "*Apologia*, I." 4, Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ εἶναι κατηγορούμεθα τὸ δὲ χρηστὸν μισέεισθαι οὐ δίκαιον. (cp. *D.T.* x. εἰ ὑμεῖς, εὐσεβεῖν λέγοντες, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ριζόμενοι διαφέρειν,). Also Theophilus, "*Ad Autolycum*," i. 12. While the Antiochene converts, in the full flood of the new teaching, readily adopted a title which emphasised their opinion of Jesus' Divine character, the Damascene, on the other hand, unable to accept the Pauline Christology, preferred a humbler denomination. For other arguments in support of the "Christian" character of this sect, and of the identification of Jesus with the "Teacher," reference should be made to Margoliouth.

<sup>178</sup> cf. *Ac.* vi. 5, 10, 11; vii. 53; viii. 1. Notice also Stephen's use of the term "the Righteous One," in *Ac.* vii. 52; and cp. "The Teacher of Righteousness" in the document. Perhaps the conception of two Messiahs is due to the influence of the pseudepigraphical literature, in which the Messiah is depicted in very diverse forms. For instance, in *Eth. Enoch*, xxxviii. 2, we have "When the Righteous One shall appear before the eyes of the elect righteous;" and in the "*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*," *Levi*. 8, He appears as a Priest-King: "Be thou from henceforth the Priest of the Lord, thou and thy seed for ever." cf. Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.* pp. 228-230. The former would suit the "Teacher of Righteousness," and the latter the "Root of Planting," in the "*Zadokite*" document. In support of the theory that Stephen may have been a Sadducee, we may notice the curious hostility of the Sadducean party to the Christian society in the earliest days; *Acts* iv. 1; v. 17. The opposition of the Pharisees was of later growth. The Sadducees must have had some special reason. cf. Furneaux, "*The Acts of the Apostles*," p. 75.

<sup>186</sup> For the temple at Leontopolis, in the Heliopolitan nome, founded by Onias iv. circ. B.C. 165, and destroyed in A.D. 73, cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 9, 7; *B.J.* vii. 10, 2-4; and see *Ency. Bib.* vol. iii. col. 3510. For the temple at Elephantinê, founded possibly circ. B.C. 450, and

known to us through the Assûan papyri, cf. Driver, *"Modern Research, as Illustrating the Bible,"* pp. 28-30; *"Expositor,"* 8th series, vol. i. pp. 20-39; vol. ii. pp. 97-116, 417-434; vol. iii. pp. 69-85, 97-108, 193-207. For the temple on Gerizim, cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 8, 2; Jn. iv. 20, 21, (Is. lxvi. 1?); and see *Ency. Bib.* vol. ii. col. 1708. For the temple at Damascus, and the New Covenant, cf. *"Zadokite Document,"* p. 2, l. 2. "All ye who entered into the Covenant." p. 6, ll. 11, 12. "And all they who were brought into the covenant, they shall not enter into the Sanctuary to kindle His altar." p. 6, l. 19. "Them who entered into the New Covenant in the land of Damascus." cp. p. 19, l. 33; and p. 12, l. 1, "the city of the Sanctuary"; p. 20, l. 10, "the house of the Law." It is very possible that we have, in this Temple at Damascus, the historical occasion of Ode 4, of the *"Odes of Solomon."* The opening four verses of that Ode read: "No man, O my God, changeth thy holy place; and it is not (possible) that he should change it and put it in another place; because he hath no power over it: for thy sanctuary thou hast designed before thou didst make (other) places: that which is the elder shall not be altered by those that are younger than itself." cf. Rendel Harris, *"The Odes and Psalms of Solomon,"* pp. 92, 93; 54-60. Rendel Harris is inclined to find the occasion in the destruction of the Temple at Leontopolis; but he betrays a feeling that the hypothesis is not altogether satisfactory. The Ode is undoubtedly Christian, with strong Jewish sympathies; and the position of the writer would correspond with that of a Boëthusian convert, who was opposed to travelling the full lengths of his fellow-sectaries, and who would probably have been one of those who seceded from the sect to the Christian Church; cf. *"Zadokite Document,"* p. 19, ll. 33, 34. The date of the Ode would not be affected by this identification; i.e., it would remain circ. A.D. 70-75. The conjecture as to the particular source of this Ode would probably satisfy Bernard's view that the 4th Ode is also a Christian Baptismal hymn. cf. *"Jour. Theol. Studies,"* vol. xii. pp. 18, 19. On the Odes as baptismal hymns, cf. *"Journ. Theol. Studies,"* vol. xii. pp. 1-31 (Bernard); vol. xiii. pp. 225-249 (Selwyn); *"Expositor,"* 8th series,



vol. ii. pp. 338-358 (Aytoun); vol. iii. pp. 108-112 (Wensinck), 113-119 (Rendel Harris). And in general, cf. "*Expositor*," 7th series, vol. x. pp. 52-63 (Barnes); 8th series, vol. i. pp. 193-209, 319-337 (Bacon); 385-398, 519-536 (Marshall); vol. ii. pp. 243-256 (Bacon); 283-37, 405-417 (Rendel Harris); "*Journ. Theol. Studies*," vol. xiii. pp. 372-385 (Burkitt).

202 The derivation of *צדוקים* . *Σαδδουκαιοι* from *צדק* *Σαδδουκ* is natural. For the Zadokite priesthood see Ez. xl. 46; xliii. 19; xlv. 15; xlviii. 11. Zadok, son of Ahitub, was priest in David's reign, 2 Sam. vii. 17. By Solomon he was created High-priest, in place of Abiathar, who held the office up to that time; 1 K. ii. 35; 1 Sam. xxx. 7. Zadok was descended from Eleazar, and Ahimelech, son of Abiathar, from Ithamar; the two sons of Aaron; 1 Chron. xxiv. 3. They thus represented collateral branches of the priestly caste. We find that Azariah, the High-priest in the days of Hezekiah, was of the house of Zadok; 2 Chron. xxxi. 10; and that Ezra the scribe was Zadok's descendant in the fifth generation; Ezra vii. 2. The Assidæans, in 1 Macc. vii. 14, seem to conjecture a line of Aaron, however, which was not the Zadokite, and may have been that of Ithamar. On the Zadokite priesthood cf. "*Journ. Theol. Studies*," vol. vi. pp. 161-186 (Kennett); vol. vii. pp. 1-9 (McNeile); pp. 620-624 (Kennett). On the Sadducees, as a sect originating from Zadok the disciple of Antigonus of Soko, cf. Taylor, "*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*," pp. 112-115. See also Cowley, in *Ency. Bib.* vol. iv. cols. 4234-4248. Cowley argues that the party had no distinct beginning, but was always in being as a conservative opposition; and that gradually it came to express the cohesion of a wealthy aristocracy. In the same way, he attaches no special signification to the name; but proposes a derivation from the Persian "*zanādika*," which practically had the meaning of "infidel." Be this as it may, and supposing the claim of the Sadducean priesthood to derive from Zadok to be unhistorical, yet it seems clear that such was the meaning attached to the name in the period of which we

are writing. On the doctrines of the Sadducees, cf. Schürer, *H.J.R.*, II. ii. pp. 29-43.

<sup>204</sup> For Hyrcanus' relations with the Sadducees, cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 10, 6, 7; for those of Alexander, xiii. 15, 5; for Alexandra's connection with the Pharisees, xiii. 16, 1, 2; for the Maccabæan policy, xii. 10, 7; and for the Sadducean connection with Antiochus and Rome, xiii. 8, 2; 9, 2. Two passages from Josephus may be quoted in full, as giving a summary account of both Sadducees and Pharisees. *Ant.* xiii, 10, 6. Νῦν δὲ δηλῶσαι βούλομαι ὅτι νόμιμα πολλά τινα παρέδωσαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς, ἅπερ οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωϋσέως νόμοις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα τὸ Σαδδουκαίων γένος ἐκβάλλει, λέγον ἐκείνα δεῖν ἡγείσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα, τὰ δ' ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν. καὶ περὶ τούτων ζητήσεως αὐτοῖς καὶ διαφορὰς γενέσθαι συνέβαινε μεγάλαι, τῶν μὲν Σαδδουκαίων τοὺς εὐπόρους μόνον πειθόντων, τὸ δὲ δημοτικὸν οὐχ ἐπόμενον αὐτοῖς ἐχόντων, τῶν δὲ Φαρισαίων τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον ἐχόντων. *B.J.* ii. 8, 14. Δύο δὲ τῶν προτέρων, Φαρισαῖοι μὲν, οἱ δοκοῦντες μετ' ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἐπάγοντες αἵρεσιν, εἰμαρμένην τε καὶ Θεῷ προσάπτουσι πάντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν πράττειν τὰ δίκαια, καὶ μὴ, κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κείσθαι, βοηθεῖν δὲ εἰς ἕκαστον καὶ τὴν εἰμαρμένην ψυχὴν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἄφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὴν δὲ τῶν φαίλων αἰδίδω τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι. Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ, τὸ δεύτερον τάγμα, τὴν μὲν εἰμαρμένην παντάπασιν ἀναιροῦσι, καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν κακὸν ἢ μὴ θρᾶν τίθενται· φασὶ δὲ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκλογῇ, τό τε καλὸν καὶ τὸ κακὸν προκείσθαι, καὶ τὸ κατὰ γνώμην ἐκάστῳ τούτων ἐκατέρῳ προσίεναι. ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονὴν, καὶ τὰς κατ' ἥδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσθαι. For the doctrines of Fate and Free Will, cf. *Ant.* xiii. 5, 9. Οἱ μὲν οὖν Φαρισαῖοί τινα καὶ οὐ πάντα τα εἰμαρμένης εἶναι λέγουσιν ἔργον, τινὰ δ' ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὑπάρχειν, συμβαίνειν τε καὶ οὐ γίνεσθαι. . . . Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ, τὴν μὲν εἰμαρμένην ἀναιροῦσιν, οὐδὲν εἶναι ταύτην ἀξιοῦντες, οὔτε κατ' αὐτὴν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τέλος λαμβάνειν, ἅπαντα δὲ ἐφ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τίθεντα, ὡς καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίους ἡμᾶς

αὐτοὺς γινομένους, καὶ τὰ χεῖρω παρὰ ἡμετέραν ἀβουλίαν λαμβάνοντας. For the Sadducean veneration for the Torah, cf. *Ant.* xviii. i, 4. Σαδδουκαίοις δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ὁ λόγος συναφανίζει τοῖς σώμασι. φυλακῆς δὲ οὐδαμῶν τινῶν μεταποίησις αὐτοῖς ἢ τῶν νόμων. This is a strong denial of any future life, and must be set over against Acts xxiii. 8: "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both;" which might only imply a denial of the developed eschatology and angelology of the Pharisees, which was largely Zoroastrian; and against Mt. xxii. 23 (cf. Mk. xii. 18; Lk. xx. 27) "there came to him Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection," which may only mean a denial of the resurrection of the body. At the same time it must be admitted that Josephus probably overstated things, in an attempt to treat Jewish sects as it was customary to treat Greek philosophical schools, and classify them according to their opinions.

<sup>223</sup> נָזִיר "the consecrated one." The history of the Nazarites is obscure. The *locus classicus* is Num. vi. 1-21; but this is not pre-exilic, and merely gives careful directions for a custom in general use. Possibly the life-vow was the original form; and it may have been adopted by those who, in the service of their god, were carving out fresh territories from themselves, and were obliged to meet the opposition of alien deities. The later form, of a vow taken for a limited time and for a particular purpose, would also have been associated with war, patriotism, and religion; that is, for some public advantage. But in post-exilic and New Testament times the vow had a mere personal significance. Thus in John's case it is to be remarked that the vow was lifelong, and its reason not that of personal gain; in other words, he was a Nazarite of the pre-exilic type. The three vows of the Nazarite were (i) abstinence from wine (ii) refraining to cut the hair until the accomplishment of the period (iii) avoidance of all uncleanness. The first was, probably, "a religious protest against Canaanite civilization in favour of the simple life of ancient times." cf. W. R. Smith, "*Prophets of Israel*," p. 85. John's

was eminently a call to return to a simple life; and he avoided wine. Lk. i. 15. The second was a symbol of consecration to God. cf. W. R. Smith, *op. cit.* p. 483. We may assume that John let his hair grow, though we have no evidence of it; and certainly his life was a consecrated one. The third was of a piece with Levitical purity; and probably John secured that by his life in the desert. cf. Lk. i. 80. On the Nazarites, see Hastings' *Dict. of Bib.* vol. iii. pp. 497-500. *Ency. Bib.* vol. iii. cols. 3362-3364. John's experiment was not altogether singular in his day; we may instance the case of Banus, the teacher of Josephus. But of him we know so little, that we can hardly say the case is an analogous one. cf. Josephus, *Vita*, 2. Καὶ μηδὲ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἐμπειρίαν ἰκεινήν ἑμαυτῷ νομίσας εἶναί, πυνθόμενός τινα Βανοῦν ὄνομα κατὰ τὴν ἐρημίαν διατρίβειν, ἐσθῆτι μὲν ἀπὸ δένδρων χρώμενον, τροφήν δὲ τὴν αὐτομάτως φυομένην προσδερόμενον, ψυχρῷ δὲ ὕδατι τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα πολλάκις λούομενον πρὸς ἀγνείαν, ζηλωτὴς ἐγεγρόμην αὐτοῦ· καὶ διατρίψας παρ' αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτοὺς τρεῖς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τελειώσας, εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὑπέστρεφον. We may, perhaps, see in Banus a precursor of the Hemerobaptists.



## INDEX

## I. REFERENCES TO SCRIPTURE AND ANCIENT WRITINGS.

GENESIS.		PAGE			PAGE
i. 2	.	201	xvi. 2	.	232
xv. 9	.	202	xvi. 14-19	.	209
xxii.	.	212	xviii. 16	.	80
xxxviii. 12	.	201	xviii. 21	.	210
			xx. 2-5	.	210
			xxi. 1-5	.	216
			xxvi. 14	.	209
EXODUS.			NUMBERS.		
xii. 22	.	209	iv. 3, 39	.	236
xvi. 10	.	232	vi. 1-21	.	252
xix. 9, 16	.	232	viii. 7	.	21, 210
xxiii. 7	.	226	viii. 8	.	21
xxiv. 15, 16	.	232	viii. 21	.	210
xxix. 4	.	210	viii. 24, 25	.	236
xxix. 16	.	209	xi. 25	.	232
xxx. 18-21	.	210	xi. 28, 29	.	107
xxxiii. 9	.	232	xix. 13	.	210
			xxix. 1	.	33
			xxxi. 19	.	210
LEVITICUS.			DEUTERONOMY.		
iv. 3	.	222	xii. 31	.	212
v. 7	.	202	xviii. 10	.	212
xi. 22	.	237	xviii. 15	.	59, 98, 232
xii. 8	.	202	xix. 10-14	.	21
xiv. 1-32	.	21			
xiv. 4-7	.	209			
xiv. 14	.	209			
xiv. 49-53	.	202			
xv. 13	.	21			

# 256 JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION TO JESUS

	PAGE		PAGE
xxi. 6-9 . . . . .	21	v. 3, 4 . . . . .	235
xxv. 5 . . . . .	80	ix. 31 . . . . .	33
xxx. 15 . . . . .	242		
		JOB.	
JOSHUA.		xxviii. 12, 20, 23 . . . . .	225
vii. 19 . . . . .	204		
xiii. 27 (LXX.) . . . . .	199	PSALMS.	
I SAMUEL.		ii. 7 . . . . .	203
xxx. 7 . . . . .	250	xxvi. 6 . . . . .	21
2 SAMUEL.		xxx. 4, 5 . . . . .	172
vii. 17 . . . . .	250	xxx. 24 . . . . .	172
I KINGS.		xxxv. 28 . . . . .	172
ii. 35 . . . . .	250	xli. 6 (LXX) . . . . .	82
viii. 33-40 . . . . .	204	lxxiv. 14 . . . . .	240
2 KINGS.		lxxviii. 25 . . . . .	240
i. 8 . . . . .	237	lxxx. 3 . . . . .	33
xvii. 31 . . . . .	212	cv. 40 . . . . .	240
xxii. . . . .	246	cvi. 37 . . . . .	212
xxiii. 10 . . . . .	210		
I CHRONICLES.		PROVERBS.	
xxiv. 3 . . . . .	250	viii. 22-31 . . . . .	225
2 CHRONICLES.		xxviii. 13 . . . . .	205
xxxi. 10 . . . . .	250		
EZRA.		CANTICUM.	
vii. 2 . . . . .	250	v. 2 . . . . .	201
NEHEMIAH.			
ix. . . . .	204	ISAIAH.	
ix. 15 . . . . .	240	i. 16 . . . . .	183, 211
ESTHER.		i. 17 . . . . .	183
i. 10, 11 . . . . .	235	ii. 2, 3 . . . . .	206
ii. 9 . . . . .	235	ix. 6, 7 . . . . .	206
iv. 3, 16 . . . . .	33	xi. 2 . . . . .	16
		xix. 24 . . . . .	206
		xxx. 33 . . . . .	211
		xxxiv. 4 . . . . .	228
		xl. 3 . . . . .	204
		xl. 5 . . . . .	204
		xl. 1 . . . . .	203
		lii. 13 . . . . .	222
		lii. 15 . . . . .	99
		liii. 2, 7 . . . . .	99, 100

	PAGE		PAGE
lv. 7 . . . . .	183	ii. 16 . . . . .	216
lviii. 5 . . . . .	216	ii. 28 . . . . .	104
lx. 8 . . . . .	201		
lxi. 1, 2 . . . . .	42	AMOS.	
lxii. 2 . . . . .	16	iii. 2 . . . . .	206, 209
lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12 . . . . .	204	v. 18 . . . . .	206
lxvi. 1 . . . . .	249	v. 20 . . . . .	206
lxvi. 24 . . . . .	212	vii. 14, 15 . . . . .	18
JEREMIAH.		MICAH.	
iii. 11 . . . . .	226	iv. 1, 2 . . . . .	206
vii. 3-7 . . . . .	183	vi. 8 . . . . .	183
viii. 31, 32 . . . . .	212		
xix. 4-6 . . . . .	212	NAHUM.	
xxi. 8 . . . . .	242	ii. 7 . . . . .	201
xxxii. 35 . . . . .	210		
		ZECHARIAH.	
EZEKIEL.		i. 3, 4 . . . . .	183
i. 1 . . . . .	201	viii. 19 . . . . .	33
vii. 16 . . . . .	201	xiii. 1 . . . . .	99, 211
xvi. 21 . . . . .	212	xiv. 6-9 . . . . .	241
xviii. 19-32 . . . . .	183		
xxiii. 37-39 . . . . .	212	MALACHI.	
xxxvi. 24-27 . . . . .	211	iii. 1 . . . . .	44, 204, 223
xxxvi. 25-27 . . . . .	183	iv. 5 . . . . .	17, 58, 64, 223
xxxvi. 25 . . . . .	99	iv. 6 . . . . .	58, 65
xl. 46 . . . . .	250		
xlvi. 19 . . . . .	250	I ESDRAS (3 EZRA).	
xliv. 15 . . . . .	246, 250	viii. 69 (73) . . . . .	82
xliv. 25 . . . . .	216		
xlvi. 1 . . . . .	250	2 ESDRAS (4 EZRA).	
		i. 19 . . . . .	240
DANIEL.		ii. 18 . . . . .	58
v. 6 . . . . .	231	v. 1-12 . . . . .	241
vii. 13 . . . . .	221, 232	vi. 24 . . . . .	241
ix. . . . .	204	vii. 36 . . . . .	212
xii. 1 . . . . .	241	xiii. 3-13 . . . . .	221
xii. 2 . . . . .	212	xiii. 29-32 . . . . .	241
JOEL.		WISDOM.	
ii. 12, 13 . . . . .	183	i. 5-7 . . . . .	201



# 258 JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION TO JESUS

	PAGE		PAGE
iv. 19 . . . . .	212	v. 22, 29, 30 . . . . .	212
vii. viii. . . . .	225	vi. 25-34 . . . . .	239
xvi. 20 . . . . .	240	vii. 13, 14 . . . . .	242
xix. 21 <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	240	vii. 22 . . . . .	107
		viii. 11, 12 . . . . .	224
ECCLESIASTICUS.		ix. 14-17 . . . . .	32-39
xv. 17 . . . . .	242	x. 4 . . . . .	176
xvii. 6 . . . . .	242	x. 28 . . . . .	212
xxiv. . . . .	225	xi. 2-19 . . . . .	40-52
xlvi. 10 . . . . .	58, 223	xi. 2-11 . . . . .	219
		xi. 2 . . . . .	219
I MACCABEES.		xi. 7-11 . . . . .	219, 221
ii. 42 . . . . .	172, 173	xi. 7, 8 . . . . .	221
iv. 2 . . . . .	217	xi. 9 . . . . .	16
v. 46 . . . . .	16, 59	xi. 10 . . . . .	204, 223
vii. 13 . . . . .	173	xi. 11 . . . . .	224, 225
vii. 14 . . . . .	250	xi. 12 . . . . .	219, 224, 225
xiv. 41 . . . . .	16, 59, 222	xi. 13 . . . . .	219, 225
		xi. 14 . . . . .	56, 219, 221, 232
2 MACCABEES.		xi. 15 . . . . .	219
ii. 8 . . . . .	232	xi. 16-19 . . . . .	218, 219
xv. 13-16 . . . . .	58	xi. 16 <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	50
		xi. 19 . . . . .	225
MATTHEW.		xii. 18-21 . . . . .	203
i. 19 . . . . .	179	xii. 33, 34 . . . . .	208
vi. 1-12 . . . . .	208	xii. 39-42 . . . . .	220, 221
iii. 1-3, 5-12 . . . . .	15-27	xii. 40 . . . . .	221
iii. 1 . . . . .	204	xii. 42 . . . . .	226
iii. 3 . . . . .	204	xiii. 30, 41, 42 . . . . .	208
iii. 5 . . . . .	199, 203	xiv. 1, 2 . . . . .	52-62
iii. 7 . . . . .	19, 46	xiv. 3-12 . . . . .	69-85
iii. 7-10 . . . . .	208	xiv. 3 . . . . .	76
iii. 7-12 . . . . .	208	xiv. 9 . . . . .	82
iii. 9 . . . . .	206, 224	xvi. 6, 11 . . . . .	54
iii. 11 . . . . .	209	xvi. 14 . . . . .	57
iii. 12 . . . . .	212	xvi. 21 . . . . .	200
iii. 13-17 . . . . .	11-14	xvii. 1-13 . . . . .	62-68
iii. 17 . . . . .	205	xvii. 5 . . . . .	202
iv. 1 . . . . .	200	xvii. 10 . . . . .	16
iv. 12, 17 . . . . .	83	xviii. 9 . . . . .	212
		xix. 1 . . . . .	111

	PAGE		PAGE
xxi. 9 . . . . .	59, 222	vi. 14 . . . . .	5
xxi. 11 . . . . .	59	vi. 17-29 . . . . .	69-85
xxi. 12 . . . . .	202	vi. 17 . . . . .	76
xxi. 23-27 . . . . .	27-31, 47	vi. 22 . . . . .	77, 235
xxi. 28-31 <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	47	vi. 26 . . . . .	82
xxi. 31 <sup>b</sup> , 32 . . . . .	46	vii. 15 . . . . .	218
xxi. 31 . . . . .	224	viii. 15 . . . . .	54
xxi. 32 . . . . .	242	viii. 28 . . . . .	57
xxii. 23 . . . . .	252	viii. 29-33 . . . . .	222
xxiii. 15, 33 . . . . .	212	ix. 2-13 . . . . .	62-68
xxiii. 25, 26 . . . . .	210	ix. 7 . . . . .	202
xxiii. 34 . . . . .	226	ix. 8 . . . . .	232
xxiv. 5 . . . . .	97	ix. 11, 12 . . . . .	208
xxiv. 8 . . . . .	241	ix. 38-40 . . . . .	106, 107
xxiv. 23 . . . . .	97	ix. 43, 45, 47 . . . . .	212
xxiv. 24 . . . . .	97, 241	ix. 48 . . . . .	212
xxiv. 29 . . . . .	227	x. 1 . . . . .	111
xxv. 1 . . . . .	217	x. 39 . . . . .	120
xxvi. 26-29 . . . . .	240	x. 45 . . . . .	222
xxvi. 38 . . . . .	82	xi. 15 . . . . .	202
xxvi. 64 . . . . .	221	xi. 25 . . . . .	228
xxvii. 20 . . . . .	247	xi. 27-33 . . . . .	27-31
xxvii. 52, 53 . . . . .	59	xii. 18 . . . . .	252
xxvii. 57 . . . . .	179	xiii. 26 . . . . .	232
xxviii. 19 . . . . .	119, 213	xiv. 62 . . . . .	221, 232
		xv. 43 . . . . .	178

MARK.

i. 1 . . . . .	205
i. 2-8 . . . . .	208
i. 2-4 . . . . .	15-27
i. 2 . . . . .	44, 208
i. 5 . . . . .	203
i. 6 . . . . .	86
i. 7, 8 . . . . .	15-27, 208
i. 9-11 . . . . .	11-14
i. 14 . . . . .	83, 205
i. 15 . . . . .	83, 205, 213
ii. 18-22 . . . . .	32-39
iii. 18 . . . . .	176
vi. 2 . . . . .	226
vi. 14-16 . . . . .	52-62

LUKE.

5-25 . . . . .	86-92
6 . . . . .	179
15 . . . . .	253
28, 30 . . . . .	179
36, 39-45, 56-66 . . . . .	86-92
80 . . . . .	86-92, 253
ii. 2 . . . . .	236
ii. 15 . . . . .	154
ii. 24 . . . . .	202
ii. 25 . . . . .	178
ii. 37 . . . . .	179
iii. 1 . . . . .	74
iii. 1, 2 <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	86-92

# 260 JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION TO JESUS

	PAGE		PAGE
iii. 2 <sup>b</sup> -9 . . . . .	15-27	ix. 28-36 . . . . .	62-68
iii. 3 . . . . .	203	ix. 34 . . . . .	232
iii. 4-6 . . . . .	204	ix. 35 . . . . .	202
iii. 7-9 . . . . .	208	ix. 49, 50 . . . . .	106, 107
iii. 10-14 . . . . .	86-92, 114	x. 1 . . . . .	20
iii. 15-18 . . . . .	15-27	xi. 1 . . . . .	20, 112-115
iii. 15 . . . . .	20, 96, 126	xi. 19 . . . . .	107
iii. 16 . . . . .	117, 126, 208	xi. 20 . . . . .	107
iii. 17 . . . . .	208	xi. 29-32 . . . . .	220, 221
iii. 18 . . . . .	205	xi. 30 . . . . .	221
iii. 19 . . . . .	235	xi. 31, 32 . . . . .	221
iii. 19, 20 . . . . .	69-85	xi. 49 . . . . .	225
iii. 21, 22 . . . . .	11-14	xii. 5 . . . . .	212
iii. 22 . . . . .	203	xii. 49, 50 . . . . .	119
iii. 23 . . . . .	236	xiii. 1-5 . . . . .	76
iv. 18, 19 . . . . .	42	xiii. 31-33 . . . . .	20
iv. 24-27 . . . . .	220	xiii. 31, 32 . . . . .	55
v. 17 . . . . .	228	xvi. 14 . . . . .	20
v. 33-39 . . . . .	32-39	xvi. 15 . . . . .	227
v. 30, 33 . . . . .	216	xvi. 16 . 40-52, 219, 224, 225	
v. 39 . . . . .	32	xviii. 23 . . . . .	82
vi. 12 . . . . .	20	xx. 1-8 . . . . .	27-31
vi. 15 . . . . .	176	xx. 27 . . . . .	252
vii. 11 . . . . .	220	xxi. 8 . . . . .	222
vii. 17 . . . . .	219, 220	xxi. 26 . . . . .	228
vii. 18-28 . . . . .	40-52, 219	xxi. 36 . . . . .	241
vii. 18 . . . . .	219, 220	xxii. 28 . . . . .	241
vii. 19 . . . . .	219, 220	xxii. 29, 30 . . . . .	240
vii. 20 . . . . .	219	xxii. 40 . . . . .	241
vii. 21 . . . . .	219	xxii. 42 . . . . .	24
vii. 22 . . . . .	220	xxiii. 8 . . . . .	54
vii. 24-28 . . . . .	219, 221	xxiii. 35 . . . . .	203
vii. 27 . . . . .	204	xxiii. 50, 51 . . . . .	179
vii. 29-35 . . . . .	40-52	xxiv. 27 . . . . .	243
vii. 29 . . . . .	46, 219, 224	xxiv. 49 . . . . .	228
vii. 30 . . . . .	46, 219		
vii. 31 . . . . .	50		
vii. 31-35 . . . . .	219		
vii. 32-35 . . . . .	218		
ix. 7-9 . . . . .	52-62		
ix. 19 . . . . .	53		

## JOHN.

i. 1 . . . . .	237
i. 6-8 . . . . .	93-102
i. 8 . . . . .	238
i. 14 . . . . .	237

	PAGE		PAGE
i. 15 . . . . .	93-102, 96	xix. 38 . . . . .	178
i. 19-37 . . . . .	93-102	xix. 39 . . . . .	178
i. 19, 20 . . . . .	154	xx. 22 . . . . .	119
i. 20-23 . . . . .	204		
i. 21 . . . . .	59	Acts.	
i. 23 . . . . .	237	i. 4 <sup>b</sup> , 5 . . . . .	116-127
i. 24 . . . . .	20	i. 13 . . . . .	176
i. 26, 27 . . . . .	27	i. 21, 22 . . . . .	116-127
i. 31 . . . . .	14	ii. 5 . . . . .	178
i. 32 . . . . .	27	ii. 37 . . . . .	178
i. 33 . . . . .	14, 27	ii. 38 . . . . .	116-127, 119
i. 35-37 . . . . .	102	ii. 41 . . . . .	178
i. 40 . . . . .	93-102	ii. 46 . . . . .	149
i. 51 . . . . .	201	iii. 1 . . . . .	149
ii. 14, 16 . . . . .	202	iii. 6 . . . . .	107
iii. 1-15 . . . . .	175, 178	iii. 22 . . . . .	59
iii. 22-24 . . . . .	102-106	iii. 26 . . . . .	222
iii. 22 . . . . .	199	iv. 1 . . . . .	248
iii. 23 . . . . .	199, 203	v. 12 . . . . .	149
iii. 25-30 . . . . .	107-110	v. 17 . . . . .	248
iii. 26 . . . . .	119	v. 20 . . . . .	149
iii. 28, 29 . . . . .	217	v. 36 . . . . .	97, 176
iv. 1-3 . . . . .	102-106	v. 37 . . . . .	176
iv. 20, 21 . . . . .	249	vi. 5 . . . . .	248
iv. 25 . . . . .	222	vi. 7 . . . . .	147, 178
iv. 34 . . . . .	24	vi. 10, 11 . . . . .	248
v. 30 . . . . .	24	vii. 37 . . . . .	59
v. 33, 34 <sup>a</sup> , 35, 36 <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	238	vii. 52 . . . . .	248
vi. 14 . . . . .	59	vii. 53 . . . . .	248
vi. 32, 35 . . . . .	240	viii. 1 . . . . .	248
vi. 38-40 . . . . .	24	viii. 1-4 . . . . .	148
vii. 39 . . . . .	118	viii. 10 . . . . .	228
vii. 40, 41 . . . . .	59	viii. 14-17 . . . . .	116-127
viii. 33-44 . . . . .	46	viii. 37 . . . . .	204
viii. 37-39 . . . . .	208, 209	ix. 1 . . . . .	148
viii. 57 . . . . .	236	ix. 2 . . . . .	148, 243
ix. 2 . . . . .	21	ix. 3-7 . . . . .	202
x. 40-42 . . . . .	111, 112	ix. 20, 22 . . . . .	150
x. 41 . . . . .	55	x. 36-38 . . . . .	116-127
xi. 52 . . . . .	226	x. 38 . . . . .	24
xii. 28-30 . . . . .	202	x. 42-48 . . . . .	116-127



	PAGE		PAGE
i. 5 . . . . .	226	xlvii. 2 . . . . .	221
i. 12 . . . . .	241	xlviii. 2 . . . . .	221
iii. 6 . . . . .	212	xlviii. 9 . . . . .	212
iii. 15 . . . . .	226	xliv. 3 . . . . .	16
v. 16 . . . . .	205	xliv. 27 . . . . .	221
		li. 3 . . . . .	221
I PETER.		lii. 4 . . . . .	206
i. 6 . . . . .	241	liv. 1, 2 . . . . .	212
i. 14 . . . . .	226	lxi. 10 . . . . .	228
iii. 22 . . . . .	228	lxii. 6 . . . . .	221
		lxii. 12, 13 . . . . .	212
2 PETER.		xc. 18 . . . . .	209
i. 17 . . . . .	202	xc. 20-27 . . . . .	207
ii. 3 . . . . .	242	xc. 26, 27 . . . . .	212
ii. 9 . . . . .	241	xcv. 7 . . . . .	207
ii. 14 . . . . .	226	xcix. 4-9 . . . . .	247
I JOHN.		BOOK OF JUBILEES.	
ii. 18 . . . . .	241	xxiv. 30 . . . . .	209
ii. 22 . . . . .	241	xxxv. 18-20 . . . . .	174, 175
iii. 10 . . . . .	226		
v. 6 . . . . .	136, 242	TESTAMENTS OF THE XII.	
		PATRIARCHS.	
REVELATION.		Levi, 8 . . . . .	248
i. 7 . . . . .	232		
ii. 17 . . . . .	240	ASCENSION OF ISAIAH.	
iii. 10 . . . . .	241	iii. 13 . . . . .	203
vi. 16 . . . . .	209	v. 14 . . . . .	201
x. 4 . . . . .	202		
xiv. 13 . . . . .	202	ASSUMPTION OF MOSES.	
xix. 7 . . . . .	217	x. 1, 3, 7 . . . . .	207
		x. 10 . . . . .	212
		xii. 6 . . . . .	58
ETHIOPIC ENOCH.		APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH.	
xxvii. 1, 2 . . . . .	212	xxvii. 1-13 . . . . .	241
xxxviii. 2 . . . . .	248	xxix. 3 . . . . .	207
xl. 5 . . . . .	203	xxix. 8 . . . . .	240
xliv. 2 <sup>b</sup> -5 <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	206	xxx. 1 . . . . .	207
xliv. 3 . . . . .	221	lix. 10 . . . . .	212

# 264 JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION TO JESUS

	PAGE		PAGE
PSALMS OF SOLOMON.		v. 20, 21 . . . . .	151
iii. 13 <sup>b</sup> , 14 . . . . .	207	vi. 5 . . . . .	151
v. 21 <sup>b</sup> , 22 . . . . .	207	vi. 11 . . . . .	153, 249
xiv. 6 <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	207	vi. 12 . . . . .	249
xv. 13 <sup>b</sup> -15 <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	207	vi. 19 . . . . .	249
xvii. 23, 28, 35 <sup>b</sup> , 36 . . . . .	207	vii. 7 . . . . .	246
xvii. 42 . . . . .	16	vii. 19 . . . . .	152
		vii. 20 . . . . .	153
SLAVONIC ENOCH.		x. 7 . . . . .	236
i. 7 . . . . .	231	xii. 1 . . . . .	249
x. . . . .	212	xiii. 1 . . . . .	153
xxx. 15 . . . . .	242	xiv. 7, 9 . . . . .	236
xxxii. 1 . . . . .	207	xix. 16 . . . . .	154
xxxiii. 2 . . . . .	207	xix. 33 . . . . .	151, 249
xl. 12 . . . . .	212	xix. 34 . . . . .	151, 249
xl. 2 . . . . .	212	xix. 35 . . . . .	153
		xx. 1 . . . . .	153
SIBYLLINE ORACLES.		xx. 10 . . . . .	249
vii. 149 . . . . .	240	xx. 13-15 . . . . .	151
ODES OF SOLOMON.		PIRQE ABOTH.	
iv. 1-4 . . . . .	249	iii. 20 . . . . .	239
xxiv. 1 . . . . .	202	iv. 7 . . . . .	246
ZADOKITE MANIFESTO.		v. 24 . . . . .	236
i. 1 . . . . .	246	vi. 2 . . . . .	202
i. 7 . . . . .	153	BERAKHOTH.	
ii. 8, 9 . . . . .	154	v. 1 . . . . .	172
i. 10 . . . . .	27, 154	viii. 4 . . . . .	210
i. 11 . . . . .	27, 154, 247	16 <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	239
i. 14 . . . . .	150	29 <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	239
i. 20, 21 . . . . .	247	JOSEPHUS.	
ii. 2 . . . . .	249	Ant. iv. 8, 23 . . . . .	217
ii. 11 . . . . .	152	„ xi. 8, 2 . . . . .	249
ii. 12 . . . . .	27, 152, 247	„ xii. 9, 7 . . . . .	248
ii. 13 . . . . .	27, 247	„ xii. 10, 2 . . . . .	173
iv. 1-3 . . . . .	246	„ xii. 10, 7 . . . . .	251
iv. 3 . . . . .	151	„ xiii. 2, 8 . . . . .	251
iv. 7 . . . . .	247	„ xiii. 5, 9 . . . . .	179, 251
iv. 13 . . . . .	150	„ xiii. 9, 2 . . . . .	251
v. 2-5 . . . . .	246		

	PAGE	DIDACHE.	PAGE
Ant. xiii. 10, 5 . . .	170	i. 1 . . . . .	242
„ xiii. 10, 6 . . .	251	viii. . . . .	33
„ xiii. 10, 7 . . .	251	viii. 3 . . . . .	239
„ xiii. 15, 5 . . .	251		
„ xiii. 16, 1 . . .	252	EPISTLE OF BARNABAS.	
„ xiii. 16, 2 . . .	252	v. . . . .	242
„ xv. 9, 3 . . .	247	xviii. . . . .	242
„ xvii. 1, 2 . . .	73		
„ xvii. 3, 2 . . .	73	PASTOR OF HERMAS.	
„ xvii. 8, 1 . . .	74	Mand. vi. 1, 2 . . .	242
„ xvii. 11, 4 . . .	74		
„ xvii. 13, 5 . . .	236	JUSTIN MARTYR.	
„ xviii. 1, 1 . . .	177, 236	D.T. viii. . . . .	229
„ xviii. 1, 4 . . .	252	„ xiv. . . . .	109
„ xviii. 1, 5 . . .	179	„ xxix. . . . .	246
„ xviii. 1, 6 . . .	177	„ xxxv. . . . .	245
„ xviii. 2, 1 . . .	73	„ xlix. . . . .	228
„ xviii. 4, 6 . . .	74	„ li. . . . .	104
„ xviii. 5, 1 . . .	73, 234	„ lxxx. . . . .	246
„ xviii. 5, 2 . . .	232, 233	„ lxxxii. . . . .	245
„ xviii. 5, 4 . . .	73, 78, 234	„ lxxxviii. . . . .	201, 246
„ xviii. 7, 2 . . .	80	I. Apol. 4 . . . . .	248
„ xviii. 8, 3 . . .	174		
„ xx. 5, 1 . . .	97, 176	THEOPHILUS.	
„ xx. 5, 2 . . .	176	Ad Aut. i. 12 . . .	248
B.J. i. 28, 4 . . .	73		
„ i. 29, 2 . . .	73	ORIGEN.	
„ i. 30, 7 . . .	73	In Joh. vi. 24 . . .	199
„ ii. 6, 3 . . .	74		
„ ii. 8, 1 . . .	176	APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS	
„ ii. 8, 2-13 . . .	179	ii. 55 . . . . .	155
„ ii. 8, 14 . . .	251	v. 6 . . . . .	242
„ ii. 17, 8 . . .	176	vi. 6 . . . . .	138
„ vii. 6, 1 . . .	233	vi. 8 . . . . .	141
„ vii. 8, 1 . . .	176	vi. 15 . . . . .	139
„ vii. 10, 2-4 . . .	248	vi. 16 . . . . .	141
Vita, 2 . . . . .	253	vi. 23 . . . . .	138
		vii. 1-19 . . . . .	242
• IGNATIUS.			
Ro. 2 . . . . .	237	CLEMENTINE HOMILIES.	
Eph. xviii. . . . .	242	i. 19 . . . . .	247



## 266 JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION TO JESUS

	PAGE	HIPPOLYTUS.	PAGE
ii. 22 . . . . .	244	Refut. Haer. v. 14-17	153
ii. 23 . . . . .	139, 245	„ „ v. 20 . . .	153
ii. 24 . . . . .	245	„ „ x. 7 . . .	152
vii. 7 . . . . .	242		
		IRENÆUS.	
CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS.		Contra Haer. i. 30 . .	153
i. 53 . . . . .	142		
i. 54 . . . . .	143, 147, 245	EPIPHANIUS.	
i. 60 . . . . .	245	Ad Haer. I. xiv. . .	244
i. 63 . . . . .	245	„ „ I. xvii. 243, 244	
ii. 7 . . . . .	244	„ „ II. xxxi. 6 . .	141
ii. 8 . . . . .	244		
ii. 11 . . . . .	244	EUSEBIUS.	
		H.E. iv. 22 . . .	139, 142
PSEUDO-CLEMENT.		ARISTOTLE.	
2 Cor. vii. . . . .	205	Nic. Eth. iv. 3, 18 . .	82
PSEUDO-IGNATIUS.		OVID.	
Trall. xi. . . . .	141	Metamor. iii. 531 . .	20

## II. SUBJECTS AND AUTHORITIES.

	PAGE		PAGE
• Ain, Kārim . . . . .	106, 200, 233	Bath Qol . . . . .	13, 202, 232
Allen . . . . .	46, 50, 92, 200, 213,	Beth Nimrah . . . . .	105, 111, 199
	219, 224, 225, 217,	Boëthusians . . . . .	146, 151, 152,
	231, 239, 242		167, 247, 249
Apollos . . . . .	127-130, 243	Bridegroom's Friend . .	217
Aretas . . . . .	71, 234	Budge . . . . .	107
Asceticism . . . . .	36-38		
Assidæans . . . . .	172, 177, 178	Charles . . . . .	204, 221, 242
Baptist Sect . . . . .	99, 101, 109,	Cheyne . . . . .	225
	112, 127, 130,	Christian . . . . .	247, 248
	134, 135, 136,	Chronology . . . . .	235, 235
	143, 144, 145,	Cleobius . . . . .	141, 142
	244-246	Confession . . . . .	204

	PAGE		PAGE
Dalman	69, 87, 92, 113, 202, 217, 221, 225, 227, 238, 239	Hastings' Dict. Bib.	94, 98, 176, 201, 204, 217, 236, 239, 244, 253
Day of the Lord	64, 209	Hemerobaptists	137-140, 243, 244
Deissmann	107, 236	Herod Antipas	53-55, 73, 78, 80-82
Dositheus	141, 142, 245	Herodians	166, 167
Dositheans	140-145, 244	Herodias	72, 73, 80, 235
Dove	12, 13, 201, 202	Herod Philip	73
Driver	59, 249	Holy Spirit in Baptism	12, 13, 121-125, 132, 133, 213, 242
Edersheim	201, 216, 228	Hort	38
Elijah	58-60, 64, 228, 229	Jesus :—	
Ency. Bib.	116, 166, 170, 176, 179, 200, 202, 203, 204, 208, 211, 212, 220, 221, 225, 236, 237, 239, 243, 248, 250, 253	Baptism	11-14, 24-26, 118
Eschatology	204-207, 241	Messianic-conscious-	
Essenes	21, 179, 180	ness	61, 62, 67, 111, 203
Expositor	146, 224, 235, 249, 250	Messiah	117, 222
Farnell	210, 211	Son of Man	62, 65, 221
Fasting	33, 216, 217	Suffering-Servant	62, 65, 222
Fourth Gospel	93, 94	Spirit-baptism	17, 23
Frazer	210	Baptism of blood	119, 120
Farneaux	248	Non-ascetic	35
Gamaliel	97	Virgin-birth	13, 92
Gehenna	212	Jevons	211
Gnostics	144, 153	John Baptist :—	
Gore	25, 122, 236	Nativity	90-92
Harnack	116, 119	Priestly parentage	87
Harris	249	Public appearance	15
Harrison	211	Previous ministry	87-89, 154, 203, 204
		Manner of life	89, 237

# 268 JOHN BAPTIST AND HIS RELATION TO JESUS

	PAGE		PAGE
John Baptist ( <i>continued</i> ):—		Kennett . . .	99, 172
Vox clamantis . . .	15, 98	King . . .	153
Method of baptism . . .	12	Kingdom of Heaven . . .	224
Purpose of baptism . . .	15-27, 101	Leviathan . . .	240
Fasting . . .	35	Lightfoot . . .	137, 139, 141, 179, 204, 211, 227, 237, 242
Asceticism . . .	89	Machærus . . .	233
Prophetic succession . . .	18, 19	Manna . . .	240, 241
Prophet . . .	47, 48	Marett . . .	107
Elijah . . .	45, 56-58, 67, 68	Margoliouth . . .	146, 247
Day of the Lord . . .	18, 56, 88	Mason . . .	119, 122
Proclaims Messiah . . .	41	Messiah . . .	153, 154, 248
Predicts spirit-baptism . . .	27	Milligan . . .	236, 239
Relation to Kingdom . . .	49	Milman . . .	210
Doctrine . . .	20, 208	Moberly . . .	122, 124
Indebtedness . . .	21, 181-183	Mommsen . . .	161
Originality . . .	19, 181-183	Montefiore . . .	159
Authority . . .	31	Moulton . . .	96, 200, 224, 225, 235
Jesus' estimate . . .	44	Nazarite . . .	252, 253
Personal relations with Jesus . . .	42, 43, 50	Oesterley-Box . . .	18, 21, 33, 201, 204, 240, 248
Disappointed in Jesus . . .	79	<i>Oxford Studies</i> . . .	11, 30, 32, 42, 44, 76, 92, 208, 208, 219, 224, 225, 226, 231
Revolutionary . . .	72	Patterson . . .	162
Journey to Machærus . . .	75	Paul— . . .	
Date of execution . . .	82-85	and Baptists . . .	130-134, 144
School of Disciples . . .	143	and Judaizers . . .	147, 148, 149, 150, 248
Venerated as Messiah . . .	112, 244, 245	Peake . . .	99
Treatment in 4th Gospel . . .	95	Pharisees . . .	170-176, 251, 252
Importance depreciated . . .	237, 238		
Jonah . . .	220, 221		
<i>Jour. Theol. Studies</i> . . .	119, 146, 178, 201, 204, 249, 250		
Joyce . . .	107		
Kennedy . . .	241		

PAGE	PAGE
Pharisaic temper 36, 51, 97	Skinner . . . . . 202
Pilate . . . . . 75	Smith, G. A. . . 74, 82, 88, 160, 234
Plummer . 44, 51, 76, 120, 223, 226, 231, 239	Smith, W. R. . . 202, 211, 252, 253
Political conditions 156-158	Social conditions . 159-165
Possession . . . . . 227, 228	Spence . . . . . 242
Prayer . . . . . 238, 239	Stephen . . . . . 147, 148
Proselyte baptism . 21, 22	Suicer . . . . . 214, 227
Pseudepigrapha . 146, 178	Swete . . 30, 67, 172, 200, 203, 204, 217, 232
Purificatory rites . 209-211	240
Rackham . 122, 123, 126, 132, 243	Taylor . 239, 241, 246, 250
Ramsay . . . . . 127, 133	Temple at Damascus 249
Righteousness . 46, 213	Theudas . . . . . 97, 176
Robertson . . . . . 204	<i>Times</i> . . . . . 152
Robinson . . . . . 203	Tophet . . . . . 211, 212
Ryle . . . . . 226	Transfiguration . 62, 231
Sadducees . 147, 167-170, 250, 251, 252	Trumbull . . . . . 217
Salome . 73, 77, 234, 235	Tylor . . . . . 55, 211
Sanday . . . . . 25	Underhill . . . . . 107
Sanday-Headlam 204, 226	Waitz . . . . . 55
Schechter 140, 143, 145, 246	Way . 128, 148, 242, 243
Schürer . 33, 74, 75, 104, 137, 156, 162, 170, 171, 172, 176, 179, 211, 233, 234, 235, 236, 239, 246, 247, 251	Weiss . . . . . 38
Schweitzer . 205, 229-231	Westcott . 14, 94, 96, 104, 108, 136, 139
Scott . . . . . 62, 204, 232	Westcott-Hort . . 53
Scribes . . . . . 170-172	Westermarck . 211, 216
Seal . . . . . 205	Wisdom . . . . . 225-227
Sethians . . . . . 153	Wordsworth . 138, 242
Simon Magus 141, 142, 144, 228, 244, 245	Wright . . . . . 204
Singer . . . . . 238, 239	Zadok . . 146, 152, 167, 246, 250
	Zadokites . . . 145-155
	Zealots . . . . . 176, 177

### III. BOOKS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO.

- ALLEN : "St. Matthew," Internat. Crit. Com.  
 "Apocalypse of Baruch," ed. Charles.  
 "Apostolical Constitutions," ed. Ültzen.  
 "Ascension of Isaiah," ed. Charles.  
 "Assumption of Moses," ed. Charles.
- "Barnabas, Ep. of," ed. Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn.  
 "Berakhoth," ed. Schwab.  
 "Book of Common Prayer."  
 BUDGE : "Egyptian Magic."
- CHARLES : "Critical History of a Doctrine of the Future Life."  
 CHEYNE : "Jewish Religious Life after the Exile."  
 "Clementine Homilies," in Cotelier : "Patres Apostolici," Antwerp, 1700.  
 "Clementine Recognitions," in Cotelier.
- DALMAN : "Messianische Texte."  
 DALMAN : "The Words of Jesus," Eng. trans.  
 DREISSMANN : "Light from the Ancient East," Eng. trans.
- "Dictionary of the Bible," ed. Hastings.  
 "Didache," ed. Spence.  
 "Didache," ed. Hemmer, Oger, Laurent.
- DRIVER : "Deuteronomy," Internat. Crit. Com.  
 DRIVER : "Modern Research, as Illustrating the Bible."
- EDERSHEIM : "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah."  
 "Encyclopædia Biblica," ed. Cheyne, Black.  
 "Enoch, The Book of," ed. Charles.
- ERIPHANUS : "Adversus Haereses," ed. Petavius, Paris, 1622.
- EUSEBIUS : "Ecclesiastical History," ed. Bright.  
 "Expositor," ed. Robertson Nicoll.
- FARNELL : "The Evolution of Religion."  
 FRAZER : "The Golden Bough."  
 FURNEAUX : "Acts of the Apostles."

GRIMM-THAYER : "Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament."

GORE : "The Church and the Ministry."

GORE : "Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation."

GORE : "The Incarnation of the Son of God."

HARNACK : "Acts of the Apostles."

HARNACK : "The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels."

"Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament," ed. Brown, Driver, Briggs.

"Hermas, The Pastor of," ed. Lelong.

HIPPOLYTUS : "Refutationis omnium Haeresium," ed. Duncker, Schneidewin.

HORT : "Judaistic Christianity."

IGNATIUS : "Ephesians," "Romans," ed. Lightfoot.

IRENÆUS : "Contra Haereses," ed. Stieren.

JEVONS : "Introduction to the History of Religion."

JOSEPHUS : "Antiquitatum Judaicarum," "De Bello Judaico," "Vita," ed. Hudson, Oxford, 1720.

"Journal of Theological Studies," ed. Bethune-Baker, Brightman.

JOYCE : "The Inspiration of Prophecy."

"Jubilees, The Book of," ed. Charles.

JUSTIN MARTYR : "Apologia I.," "Dialogus cum Tryphone," ed. Paris, 1742.

KENNEDY : "St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things."

KENNEDY : "The Servant of the Lord."

KING : "The Gnostics and their Remains."

KITTEL : "Biblia Hebraica."

LITTLE AND SCOTT : "Greek-English Lexicon."

LIGHTFOOT : "Apostolic Fathers."

LIGHTFOOT : "Colossians and Philemon."

LIGHTFOOT : "Galatians."

"Livres d'Hénoch," ed. Martin.

MARETT : "The Threshold of Religion."

MASON : "*The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism.*"

MILLIGAN : "*Greek Papyri.*"

MILMAN : "*History of Latin Christianity.*"

MOBERLY : "*Atonement and Personality.*"

MOBERLY : "*Ministerial Priesthood.*"

MOMMSEN : "*History of Rome,*" Eng. trans.

MONTEFIORE : "*Hibbert Lectures.*"

MOULTON : "*Grammar of New Testament Greek,*" vol. I. "*Prolegomena.*"

"*Odes and Psalms of Solomon,*" ed. K. Harris.

OESTERLEY AND BOX : "*The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue.*"

ORIGEN : "*Commentary on St. John,*" Eng. trans. in "*Ante-Nicene Christian Library.*"

"*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem,*" ed. Sanday.

PATTERSON : "*The Nemesis of Nations.*"

PEAKE : "*The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament.*"

PLUMMER : "*St. Luke,*" Internat. Crit. Com.

"*Psaumes de Salomon,*" ed. Viteau.

RACKHAM : "*The Acts of the Apostles.*"

RAMSAY : "*The Church in the Roman Empire.*"

RAMSAY : "*St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen.*"

ROBERTSON : "*Regnum Dei.*"

ROBINSON : "*Ephesians.*"

RYLE : "*The Canon of the Old Testament.*"

SANDAY : "*Christologies, Ancient and Modern.*"

SANDAY AND HEADLAM : "*Romans,*" Internat. Crit. Com.

SCHECHTER : "*Documents of Jewish Sectaries.*"

SCHÜRER : "*A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ,*" Eng. trans.

SCHWEITZER : "*The Quest of the Historical Jesus,*" Eng. trans.

SCOTT : "*The Kingdom and the Messiah.*"

"*Secrets of Enoch, The Book of the,*" ed. Charles and Morfill.

"*Sibylline Oracles,*" ed. Geffcken.

SINGER : "*The Authorised Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations.*"

SKINNER : "*Genesis*," Internat. Crit. Com.

SMITH, G. A. : "*The Book of the Twelve Prophets.*"

SMITH, G. A. : "*Historical Geography of the Holy Land.*"

SMITH, W. R. : "*The Prophets of Israel.*"

SMITH, W. R. : "*The Religion of the Semites.*"

SUICER : "*Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus e Patribus Græcis*," Amsterdam, 1682.

SWETE : "*The Apocalypse of St. John.*"

SWETE : "*St. Mark.*"

SWETE : "*The Old Testament in Greek.*"

TAYLOR : "*The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers.*"

"*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*," ed. Charles.

THEOPHILUS : "*Ad Autolyicum*," ed. Paris, 1742.

"*Times Newspaper, The.*"

TREMBULL : "*Studies in Oriental Social Life.*"

TYLOR : "*Primitive Culture.*"

UNDERHILL : "*Mysticism.*"

WAITZ : "*Anthropology*," Eng. trans.

WEISS, B. : "*The Life of Christ*," Eng. trans.

WESTCOTT : "*The Epistles of St. John.*"

WESTCOTT : "*The Gospel of St. John.*"

WESTCOTT : "*On the Canon of the New Testament.*"

WESTCOTT AND HORT : "*The New Testament in Greek.*"

WESTERMARCK : "*The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas.*"

WORDSWORTH : "*The Ministry of Grace.*"

WRIGHT : "*Synopsis of the Gospels, in Greek.*"













